The Nation

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1919 No. 2809

The Week

WITH characteristic secrecy, the revised covenant of the League of Nations was made public only on the morning that it was laid before the delegates at the Quai d'Orsay. Monday afternoon it was taken to a plenary meeting and the obedient delegates were told to vote for it. This they did with some slight discussion and the moving of amendments which do not even seem to have been put to a vote. Thus Mr. Wilson has gained his major object in going to Paris—the adoption of a League of Nations. The revised document does not seem to have satisfied all its enemies in the United States Senate, yet it is probable that, being tied up with the treaty as it is, it will be ratified in Washington. The changes have indubitably improved it, chiefly in the way of clarifying its language. Although inferior to the Smuts proposal, and far from being a league of peoples or nations; although far from democratic and still having within it the possibilities of mischief for the human race, the experiment is now as good as launched. There are increasing signs from Berlin that the German peace delegates will sign the treaty that contains the Covenant, even if Germany is for the present to be excluded. It remains, therefore, only to watch the workings of the new device upon which such high hopes have been centred. More pressing is the question of the immediate future of Europe. Will there be a counter-league of Soviet republics? Will the two-thirds of Europe now excluded from the League continue to remain outside its scope? Can it succeed with its present undemocratic basis? Can it last longer than the Holy Alliance? Time will alone answer these questions. But even those who have opposed the present League as inadequate and misleading ought to give it the benefit of the doubt, and to hope that out of this beginning there may develop a League worthy of the name.

THE Peace Conference, it is now announced, has decreed that the former Kaiser shall be brought before a tribunal. This seems a most unfortunate decision. The scaffold, however well deserved, makes martyrs. Peaceful oblivion is surely the only safe cure for imperial ambitions. The latest news from Holland indicated that such a solution was about to be reached. The former Emperor, who thus far has been practically a prisoner of the Dutch Government, was to be removed to the castle of Hardenbroek, there to end his days as nature and his own conscience would allow. Provided he did not enter upon some risky political adventure, he was to enjoy the liberty of a private citizen. The war lord of yesterday was to become the country squire of tomorrow. That seemed to be the rational end of this strange life and this extraordinary career. William of Hohenzollern has always lived according to his own lights. Whatever his own immediate guilt, the world will forever connect his name with the horror of the past five years. The last ruler by the grace of God permitted by the grace of the people to spend his final years in the shelter of a neighborly asylum, would be an object lesson which would constitute warning to coming generations.

IN a farewell speech at the American Luncheon Club on March 14, Admiral Sims referred to his remarks at the Guildhall several years ago, when he declared that Great Britain and the United States would be found together in the next war. Further, he said that in 1910, while cruising in European waters, he submitted a secret report that in his opinion war could not be put off longer than four years. During the war a German diplomatic official stated that there was an understanding between Great Britain and the United States whereby they would stand together if either went to war with Germany. A similar statement recently came to light in this country from a Dutch source. Professor Roland G. Usher, in his "Pan-Germanism," explicitly declares that, probably before the summer of the year 1897, "an understanding was reached that in case of a war begun by Germany or Austria for the purpose of executing Pan-Germanism the United States would promptly declare in favor of England and France and would do her utmost to assist them." We do not attach too great importance to any of these statements; yet we should like to see this matter ventilated. If such an understanding was in force, did President Wilson know of it before Mr. Balfour and M. Viviani made their visit? Until three days before the war, the British Parliament knew nothing of a secret engagement that bound them hand and foot to France, and had been in force eight years; an engagement, moreover, that only eight weeks before, they had been assured did not exist. Admiral Sims's remark gains interest from the fact that the regular diplomatic technique of such engagements is by way of "conversations" between military and naval attachés of the coquetting Governments. In his book called "How Diplomats Make War," Mr. Francis Neilson, a member of the war-Parliament, traces the course of the military conversations authorized by the French and English Governments, and shows their binding effect upon foreign policy. We should be much interested in hearing from Admiral Sims again; and we believe that a healthy and vigorous public curiosity about this subject would by no means come amiss.

WHAT is going on in Ireland? After a week's news of the Limerick affair, culminating on Thursday in the scanty notice that the strike had been declared national, the censorship was clamped down tight and the press has ceased to mention Ireland. There is altogether too much reason to fear that the next news may be the story of bloodshed. In the meanwhile, certain steps in the development of the new movement have clearly disclosed themselves. Sinn Fein definitely has sloughed its political garment, and come out in the garb of a revolutionary economic formula. In a recent editorial we pointed out the logical trend of Sinn Fein from the parliamentary basis to the economic basis, and that this trend was a conscious process, fostered by the strongest Irish leadership. Every effort has been bent toward the building up of a decentralized economic organization. There were plans for a general strike on the first of July against the payment of taxes and rent. The action of the British authorities in declaring martial law in Limerick evidently set this movement off at half-cock; but the economic

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organization already had acquired strength enough to proceed. Limerick at once declared a strike against martial law, the strike committee took over the administration of the city; and it has been able to maintain that administration in the face of armed forces of occupation through the universal loyalty of the populace. Says one newspaper: "The greatest peculiarity of the Limerick situation is the public acceptance of what appears to be oppression. If the shopkeepers, manufacturers, and laborers really wanted to assert themselves as loyal British subjects they would refuse to recognize the strike committee's permits, which they must have before they are allowed to work, and then appeal to the British troops for protection and go ahead conducting their work under cover of the guns. But none has taken advantage of this privilege. . . . The city is just as strongly held by the Crown forces as Cologne, yet every shop and factory adheres to the committee's orders." Now the Limerick strike committee has formed an alliance with the Irish Trades Union Congress and the Labor party, and a general strike has been declared throughout Ireland. De Valera, the Parliamentary intellectual, the Kerensky of Ireland, has been superseded as the leader of Sinn Fein by Tom Johnson, treasurer of the Trades Union Congress, and the movement has been rallied under the banner of direct action and the economic formula. Further news is withheld; but the silence from Ireland contains more serious and significant news than most of the items from Paris and Rome.

NO American general has done better work in France than Major-General William M. Wright who returned last week. It was he who commanded the Third and Sixth Corps in France and it is related of him that he forced a river crossing which several American divisions had failed to take, despite a gallantry entailing heavy losses. General Wright, when told by General Pershing that the Commander-in-Chief expected him to cross, gave his word that he would accomplish the task. He then gathered together as many of his corporals and sergeants as possible and explained to them what the exploit called for and why he must depend upon them. The thinking American bayonets promptly responded and the crossing was taken with only nominal loss—a splendid example of a wise general and of the admirable initiative and self-reliance of the enlisted American soldier. Only those who have visited the Argonne battlefields can gauge correctly the extraordinary achievements of our soldiers there. Because of the difficult terrain, divisions and brigades, even regiments disintegrated. Yet the American soldier would not be s'opped.

CANADIAN boys are turning back from the war to the farm via the university. More than two hundred McGill students have returned to complete their interrupted college work in science and many of these plan to test their theories in agricultural practice. The Dominion will help them to the extent of loaning each soldier or sailor $8,000 for the purchase of a farm, live stock, and implements, and for the erection of his house and barn. This is in addition to the financial and educational assistance which the Canadian Government proposes to offer to all settlers. Even disabled men may profit by these provisions, as the Government allows them a year's free re-educational training. An inducement even greater than the financial or educational offering, however, is the safeguarding of health for the pioneer. The Minister of Health in Alberta says:

> It is the plain duty of the province, in maternity cases, to place a housewife in charge of the family, take the mother-to-be to a hospital, return her safely with her child, and pay all bills. The farmer and the pioneer is entitled to a squarer deal than in the past.

This provision for the well-being of the child, which is followed by health inspection in the schools, typifies the new methods of stimulating the growth of population by way of contrast with the old Quebec custom of bestowing a land bonus on the twelfth child. The Alberta farmer, with such State aid, will doubtless choose for his family quality rather than quantity.

NEVER in our recollection has there been such an outpouring of wrath upon the head of a single official as is now being showered upon Mr. Burleson. That he has been utterly incompetent as an administrator, that his whole attitude towards labor has been false and archaic—these are things which no amount of blustering denial can conceal. But the worst phase of him has been beyond question his whole mental bent. His ignorance and intolerance as a press censor and his ruthless suppression of weak periodicals because he did not like their opinions—here lies his chief offence against American honor and the American spirit. Surely, never was there an official by birth, training, and experience in life so unfit for the task of moulding and controlling public opinion as Albert Sidney Burleson. But in the hue and cry against him it must not be forgotten that the responsibility for him rests squarely upon Woodrow Wilson. He appointed and has tolerated Burleson and Redfield and, until lately, Gregory. He has permitted two of them to pursue their careers of official blundering and wrong-doing with almost complete indifference, excusing himself with the plea that he was too absorbed in international affairs. Almost every tenet of democracy was violated by Burleson and Gregory with scarcely a protest from the great democrat in the White House. Now not even Mr. Burleson's prompt resignation could save Mr. Wilson from the scandal of this particular bit of inefficiency and maladministration, which will form, however, only a chapter in the general indictment of Mr. Wilson as an administrator of the Government of the United States.

IT is possible to take too seriously every manifestation of the growth of hate and intolerance in the country, such as riots and espionage, or the suppression of German opera in New York. It is even possible to take the Overman Committee too seriously, or the Mayor of New York. But the organized forces and interests behind such manifestations are worthy of minute scrutiny. When frank incitement to riot is spread proudly through the pages of a magazine addressed to "fighting men and their backers" and labeled seditiously "true Americanism," it is worth speculating as to the source of this type of subsidized domestic treason, and its probable results. *Treat 'em Rough*, dedicated to the work of "putting our boys on the firing line at home" devotes much of a recent issue to the subject of Bolshevism. If you are out of a job, it says to the returned soldier in an editorial signed by Arthur Guy Empey, the managing publisher, "do not become a Bolshevist. If you feel like fighting, go out and smash a Red—it is a great sport knocking them off soap-boxes. . . . The Fifth Liberty Loan drive will soon be here. Make a Bolshevist or an 'I. W. W.' buy one of those bonds, and believe me, from that time on that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fellow is going to support Uncle Sam, and, if necessary, fight for him. If you cannot, after very patient endeavor, sell him, then *show* him what it means to get a good Yankee wallop in the nose." And further, as to the proper treatment for agitators, "Back him into a corner (there is no danger in this—he won't fight—none of them will), take him by the throat with your left hand, haul back that good Yankee fist of yours and preach to him True Americanism. . . ." We omit further quotations rather more brutal in tone. One concrete and logical result of this sort of talk was the complete annihilation one Sunday night of the headquarters of the Soldiers', Sailors', and Marines' Protective Association of New York, an organization of discharged men interested in securing employment, upholding union standards, and enlisting men in the A. F. of L. A gang of soldiers and sailors attacked its president, Ralph Tropp (wounded and honorably discharged from the Seventh Division), chased him to the People's House, broke up a meeting and a dance, stormed on to Twenty-third Street, and there totally demolished the office of the Association. The police "made no arrests."

A LABOR union in an American university? The news seems incredible, but here it is: A group of professors in the State-owned and controlled University of Illinois has formed a professors' "local," and, headed by a professor of history, has joined the American Federation of Labor. Thus does Bolshevism invade our most sacred precincts while the public gapes amazed. Where shall we turn if we cannot rely upon our professors to uphold the existing order at any cost? We were, of course, prepared to hear that the professors of the University of Munich have placed themselves freely at the disposal of the Munich Soviet; that they are working zealously to socialize and communize Bavaria; that they have acceded to the new rules by which the universities, and particularly the student bodies, are to govern themselves; that they shall be returned to other occupations after fifteen years of teaching, in order to get fresh touch with the outside world. That any of our American professors should join a labor union—the thought had never before occurred to us. It is so unpatriotic and treasonable as to deserve the hearty censure of George Haven Putnam and the American Defense Society. We can see in it only another argument for universal military training, so that if the professors strike, they can, after the manner of M. Briand with the railway workers, be immediately called into active military service by Secretary Baker and assigned, as reserve officers, to their old teaching jobs. What an example these professorial officials of the University of Illinois set for their humbler confrères in the state service who may also have been flirting with the labor union idea!

THE *Nation* is happy to chronicle the appearance of a newcomer in the field of weekly journalism, the *Review*, under the direction of a former editor of the *Nation*, Harold de Wolf Fuller, and of Fabian Franklin, long an associate editor of the New York *Evening Post*. This fresh recognition of the importance of the field now occupied by the *Dial*, the *New Republic*, and the *Nation* is also additional proof of the waning influence of the daily press as a means of conveying sound political teachings and reliable information. That the new weekly is to be of conservative character adds to the interest which attaches to its appearance. Every shade of opinion should have its exponents in the difficult days that are before this country. The *Review's* political platform seems to be one of having just enough reform and not too much; in other words it is to serve the useful purpose of being a brake upon the rapid drift toward the extreme left. As for the *Review's* literary side, the past volumes of the *Nation* sustain the belief that it will be of exceptional quality.

THE English Book of Common Prayer is once more in process of revision, having kept its present form for nearly sixty years. In the year 1859 three of the so-called "state services" were abolished by royal warrant: those commemorating "the happy deliverance of King James I and the three estates from the Gunpowder Plot"; "the martyrdom of the blessed King Charles I"; and the restoration of Charles II. The formal revision of 1861 involved no startling changes, and such fresh alterations as have today been tentatively adopted seem harmless enough, consisting, for the most part, in making the rubrics conform to modern ecclesiastical practice. Thus, it is proposed that the office of Matins be shortened on Communion Sundays, which practically all churches have effected by relegating the Litany to afternoon service. The use of the cope is to be authorized at Communion; the Ritualists have used it for the last fifty years, undisturbed by an occasional growl from a Low-Church bishop. The same thing may be said of the Athanasian creed, which the present rubric orders to be said thirteen times a year and which is seldom read at all. The new rubric states that it *may* be used on Trinity Sunday.

WHILE there has been no official statement as yet regarding next season's operatic repertory at the Metropolitan, it is safe to believe the persistent rumors that Olive Fremstad will be again among the singers and that she will appear in Wagner's "Parsifal" and "Tristan and Isolde." The banishment of Wagner from the Metropolitan during the war, while operas by other Germans were retained, was due to three reasons: some of the boxholders never liked his operas; the operas had always been sung in the German language, which had become taboo; and it was impossible at once to secure substitutes for the discarded German singers. The two works mentioned will, of course, be sung in English, and Mr. Gatti-Casazza will no doubt find competent singers who will make it possible in a few years to restore all the Wagner operas to the repertory. If he reads the signs of the times aright he will also produce another Russian opera or two. We know little about Russian opera over here, and it must be confessed that the experiments made with the works of Rubinstein and Tchaikovsky have not been particularly successful. But Moussorgsky's "Boris Godounoff" has been in the Metropolitan's regular list for several years, and Rimsky-Korsakoff's "Le Coq d'Or" has more than held its own for two seasons. The latter is a work of genius as well as one which appeals to the public, and if we may believe Rachmaninoff and others who know the remaining operas of that master, there are several among them equally sure of favor in this country. Stravinsky is another Russian who has become popular in New York. He is the most musical of the futurists, and his "L'Oiseau de Feu" would no doubt be welcomed as cordially as his "Petroushka" has been. The working of this Russian mine is the more desirable as nothing new in the opera field seems to be coming from France or Italy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President and the Italians

FOR once President Wilson has struck out well in Paris. For the first time since the Peace Conference began its sessions, he has appealed over the heads of his fellow architects-in-secret to the masses who gave him such an inspiring welcome upon his arrival in Europe. The result has been a remarkable quickening of interest in the Conference. Even if it now appears split by the secession of the Italians, a gain has been made. A ray of truth has illumined the fog of hypocrisy and cant which has concealed the land-grabbing going on in the name of democracy and the war to end war. If there is anything whatever in truth-telling and aboveboard dealing, this in itself is worth while. It may wreck the Conference or strengthen it; it may bring down the structure of the League of Nations now being erected, but at least it is an appeal to the public opinion of the world which has been so utterly debarred from passing upon most of what is happening in Paris. More than that, Mr. Wilson is entirely in the right in his contention about Fiume.

The more the pity that this flight of statesmanship comes so late and is hampered by the President's grave inconsistencies in the matter of Danzig, the Polish corridor and, if the report be true, Upper Silesia as well, to say nothing of other compromises. These, with much effect, are being thrown in his face by the Italians. It is indeed late in the day for the President to adopt this policy, too late we fear, when the Germans are on the road to Versailles, to save the situation. The Fiume matter is not a new one; it has been before the Peace Conference, or rather the "Big Four," for months. The Italian claim runs far beyond the secret Treaty of London. Why has not Mr. Wilson made his position public long before this? It is a fundamental principle which is involved; it goes to the root of the whole policy of self-determination, of the redistribution of territory in Europe along racial lines. It is vital to the integrity of the remainder of the fourteen points. Yet Mr. Wilson waits until the last moment to make his position clear, and he is now paying the price for his abandonment of open covenants of peace openly arrived at, the freedom of the seas, and other points that were supposed to be immutable.

What the final effect will be upon Italy remains to be seen. If Mr. Wilson hoped to overthrow Orlando at home, it would appear, at this writing, as if he had reckoned without his host. For the moment Orlando is the hero of the hour in Italy—a most welcome situation for him, since he has been in the greatest danger of falling before the revolutionary forces. Nationalistic enthusiasm and excitement such as we are now witnessing in Italy are not conducive to a liberal overturn. There can be no doubt what the tendency of the Italian revolutionary movement has been. After months of heated discussion, the bulk of the radical opinion unquestionably stands on the side of Lenine and Bela Kun and in favor of outright Soviet government. There seems even to be a general Socialist agreement to refrain from future elections, according to *Avanti*, the official organ of the Socialist Party. But so far the psychology of mass emotionalism, upon which Orlando has played so skilfully, has made against any revolutionary outbreak. Every time radicalism has approached the point of revolutionary action a national crisis has intervened to save the Government, just as in this case. Yet Orlando may in turn be hoist by his own petard. The belligerent spirit which he has aroused may run away with him and with his country. He himself admits that Italy is in desperate straits. The country depends upon England for coal, and upon the United States for food, raw materials and money. Its financial situation is among the weakest in Europe today, and the Allies had made up their minds some time ago to cut Italy adrift by the first of October and let it sink or swim, survive or perish, from that time on. How can Orlando keep away from the conference; how can he refuse to sign the peace?

We have of course insistent talk that a compromise will yet be found and the rumor that the President of Switzerland is to be arbitrator; thus a way out may possibly be found by internationalizing Fiume, but compromise will only detract further from the prestige of the Peace Conference and weaken the treaty. The latter document is obviously far from ready for the Germans even if they are assembling at Versailles. The Japanese are yet to be heard from. Their appeal to the Conference for Kiaochow and Tsingtao is a shameless one; Mr. Wilson must refuse to grant it as he has refused the Italian claim to Fiume. The fact that the Conference has wronged them in the matter of recognizing the equality of their nationals does not alter the situation as to their demands, or obscure the fact that, as appeared only last week, they compelled China to agree to cede a large portion of its territory in order to obtain their permission to enter the war! The Japanese delegation may forget the solemn promise given by their Government when Kiaochow was occupied to return the city to China as soon as the war was over. Not even the secret treaty which has now been exposed will warrant the Conference in granting an inch of Chinese territory to Japan. To do so would be to violate the fourteen points so clearly as to convict Mr. Wilson of hypocrisy in his message to Italy as well as of his further compromising. It augurs ill for the future that the Japanese do not see this as does all the rest of the world. Their continued encroachments upon China are a source of profound disappointment to their friends everywhere, weaken their case when they are in the right and injure their relations with the United States, which imperialists on both sides of the Pacific seem bound to disturb.

Thus are the Allies paying now for those outrageous secret treaties which they did not dare to allow the world to know, and which they strove to conceal even after the Bolsheviki had done the world the favor of publishing them. Would the American people have believed as whole-heartedly in the appeals to them to enter the war if they had known about these treaties and understood them? Would they have been tricked into believing that the aims of all the Allies were as unselfish as our own? We cannot believe it; nor can we acquit Mr. Wilson of his responsibility in the matter, even if he himself was unaware of these secret agreements when he committed the country to a war policy. With the mischief now done, the only question that remains is what will be the wind-up of the Conference. The next few weeks will show whether the Allies and America are defeated in victory. There must be rapid work if the Allies are to present a united front when the Germans appear. The utterly mistaken decision at Paris to try the Kaiser, which the American delegation so strongly opposed, is another proof that some in the Conference are likely to blunder until the end. Is it any wonder that the whole Western world rejoices when Mr. Wilson lets a little light into so confused, so puzzling, and so tragic a situation?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The British Coal Report

THE Sankey interim report of the British Coal Industry Commission, the text of which will be found in the International Relations Section of this issue of the *Nation*, ought to have a wide and thoughtful reading in this country. The Commission was appointed under an act of Parliament to investigate "the wages and hours of the various grades of colliery workers; the cost of production and distribution of coal, the general organization of the industry, and selling prices and profits"; together with any scheme which might be submitted for the future organization of the coal industry, and the effect of such proposals upon the development of the industry and on the economic life of the country. By the terms of the act, the Commission was required to make an interim report on hours and wages at the earliest possible moment. Three reports were in fact presented: the Sankey report, signed by Sir John Sankey, the chairman of the Commission, and three other members; another signed by three members representing the mine owners; while a third, signed by Mr. Robert Smillie, president of the Miners' Federation, and five others, embodied in full the demands of the miners.

The original demands of the miners comprised a thirty per cent. increase in wages, in addition to existing war wages; a working day of six hours instead of eight; the payment by the Government of full wages to miners who were demobilized or displaced; and the nationalization of mines and minerals. These demands were enforced by the threat of a strike which, by stopping coal production throughout the country, would not only have paralyzed British industry and commerce, but would also have entailed serious consequences upon foreign countries like France, Spain, and Italy, which depend upon Great Britain for a part or the whole of their coal supply. The Government, in reply to the miners, offered an immediate wage advance of one shilling per day to meet the increased cost of living, and an inquiry into the general question of higher wages, shorter hours, and nationalization; it declined, however, to give preferential treatment to miners who were displaced or demobilized. The miners had intended to stop work on March 15, but the announcement of the Government offer led to a postponement of the intended strike until March 22, and to an agreement on the part of the miners to participate in the inquiry. The three reports of the Commission were issued on March 20, two days before the strike was finally to have gone into effect.

The Sankey report, which it is understood will form the basis of the new Government policy, goes far beyond the proposals of the mine owners' representatives, and concedes most of the miners' demands. It recommends a reduction of the working day for underground workers to seven hours from and after July 16, 1919, and to six hours from and after July 13, 1921, subject in the latter case to "the economic position of the industry" at the end of 1920; the establishment of a week of forty-six and one-half working hours, exclusive of meal times, for mine workers above ground, beginning July 16, 1919; and a wage increase of two shillings (in the case of workers under sixteen years of age, one shilling) per shift or per day for workers whose wages in the past have been regulated by a sliding scale. The suggested advance in wages involves an estimated sum of £30,000,000 per annum, to which is to be added £13,000,000 due to an estimated decrease of ten per cent. in production, for the remainder of the present year, on account of the shortened hours. This total of £43,000,000 it is proposed to meet in part by allowing the mine owners to retain 1s. 2d. for each ton of coal raised; the balance, it is hoped, will be met by such income as may result from the miners' pledge to do their best to keep men steadily at work, and from the more extended use of improved methods of mining. In addition, the Commission proposes a tax of 1d. per ton, or about £1,000,000 per annum, for the purpose of improving housing conditions, which in some districts, the report declares, are "a reproach to our civilization," and to which "no judicial language is sufficiently strong or sufficiently severe" adequately to voice condemnation.

These are far-reaching recommendations. They are hardly more than administrative details, however, in comparison with the further recommendation, made "in the interests of the country," that the colliery worker "shall in the future have an effective voice in the direction of the mine." On the broad issue of the nationalization of mines and minerals the Sankey report offers no recommendations, partly because of lack of time, and partly because no detailed scheme was submitted to it. "Even upon the evidence already given," however, the Commission declares, "the present system of ownership and working in the coal industry stands condemned, and some other system must be substituted for it, either nationalization or a method of unification by national purchase" with or without joint control. The argument of the Commission is simple and brief. "For a generation the colliery worker has been educated socially and technically. The result is a great national asset. Why not use it? . . . We think that the result of the colliery workers having an effective voice in the direction of the mine, coupled with the better terms just referred to, will enable them to reach a higher standard of living to which, in our view, they are entitled, and which many of them do not now enjoy. . . . We think nothing but good can come from public discussion between workers and owners, and also from private deliberations between them. There has been too much secrecy in the past."

Thus does the British Government deal with a great problem of reconstruction; thus does the British worker make progress towards his goal. In spite of all the absorbing preoccupation of the Peace Conference, in spite of a threatened strike in one of the "key" industries, in which, if it had been declared, the engineers and transport workers would almost certainly have joined, the Government has time to secure an act of Parliament referring the whole subject to a Commission, and the Commission has time to prepare an epoch-making report which grants the principal demands of the miners in the matter of wages and hours and at the same time points the way clearly and simply to a new industrial order. That the new order is revolutionary does not in the least trouble the Commission; what is wanted is a plan which will do away with most, if not all, of the fundamental inequalities and injustices which have kept the British mine workers in turmoil. It is unlikely, perhaps, that the miners will rest content even with the grant of a share in the control of the industry, but will still urge nationalization; for what labor in Great Britain and in other countries appears to want is not merely some substantial amelioration of the present industrial system, or even a larger or different voice in keeping the system going, but a new system. Recent press dispatches report a further series of investigations on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the part of the Commission into the question of nationalization, and the public cross-examination by Mr. Robert Smillie of "seven coal-owning Peers." The change to some form of public ownership once begun with mines and minerals, may easily pass on to railways, factories, and other industries of obvious general utility. Even that future, however, may be faced with equanimity so long as the Government, when a crisis threatens, is prompt to provide a machinery for discussion, and workers and employers are willing to talk things over.

Two Interviews with Lenine

THE seriousness with which Europe has for some time been taking Lenine is beginning to be reflected in the American press. Paris and London, in their attitude toward the Soviet leader, have inclined of late to lay less stress upon the early conception of him as essentially a blood-thirsty and destructive autocrat, and to recognize the ability and success of his statesmanship; indeed, there are not wanting men in those capitols who hate his personality and his doctrine and at the same time speak of him as the dominating figure of the moment. William Allen White, writing from Paris, goes so far as to say: "In the meantime in eastern Europe, from Budapest to Archangel, responsible rulers, such as they may be, are laughing uproariously at Paris—at the statesmen who are solemnly sitting about green tables, figuring out boundaries, spheres of influence, and economic restrictions, when the new order in the world is establishing itself. . . . Lenine is heading the laughter." In other words, both official and public opinion in Europe are beginning to take Lenine seriously. However hatefully much of his performance may still be regarded, it is coming to be recognized that a man of intellectual force, of marked personality, and of iron will has let loose a new idea in the world. Clearly such a man must be fought with statesmanship, with a better idea, if he is to be fought at all. American opinion, on the other hand, seems disposed to dwell still in the realm of ignorance and invincible prejudice. Yet it is not without significance that two extended interviews with Lenine should have appeared last week in leading New York papers. The *New York Times* gave him a front-page column and further space inside; the *World* gave him two columns on the second page; and in each case what was printed shed light upon the man and his work.

Of the two interviews, that printed by the *World* is much more clear and straightforward. It lacks date and place line, but it purports to be a record of a conversation between Lenine and a certain M. Puntervold, "a prominent statesman of Norway." A picture is first drawn of the scene and of the chief figure in it. "Lenine spoke in an easy and lively manner, but with an undertone of confidence and convincing persuasion which gave his words emphasis. It is easy to understand why it was just he who became the power behind the Russian Revolution." The interview then goes on at once to a discussion of the agrarian question. According to M. Puntervold, Lenine emphasized the fact that, whereas the country proletariat have from the first sided with the Soviet Revolution and the large farmers or landowners have opposed it, the small farmers or peasant owners, "contrary to the more wealthy class, are now wobbling." The statement needs to be read in the light of the fact that the Soviet Government has definitely compromised with the small farmers on the question of land tenure, and has admitted the right of private ownership in tracts such as a man and his family can use. The small farmers, in other words, are "wobbling" in the direction of the Soviet Government.

It is when the interview comes to discuss the freedom of the press that it begins to throw light on the Bolshevist philosophy. According to M. Puntervold, Lenine declared that, in a social and economic revolution, freedom of the press is nothing but an outworn shibboleth. It is one thing, he urged, to raise the issue of the freedom of the press in a civil conflict within a given social and economic order; but it is quite another thing to raise the same issue in a conflict between two entirely different and antagonistic orders. "We believe that the so-called freedom of the press means only the right of the bourgeoisie to fool the people and lie to them. The bourgeoisie own the entire capital of the newspapers, the printing materials and machinery, and the newspapers themselves. . . . The freedom of the press is the same as freedom for capital. . . . The press only for the proletariat—nothing for capital. That is our slogan. . . . To establish a free press at present would be the same thing as to announce that the war is ended before it really is." Lenine went on to say that as soon as a party subscribed to the new social and economic order, it would be allowed to have its free newspaper organs. The Menshivik press has already been legalized in this fashion, and he thought that it would be possible soon to legalize the press of the Social Revolutionary party. "The opposition press will soon be unmuzzled, all in the degree to which the different parties are willing to work loyally and willingly with us." "With us," of course, means with the Soviet order. For the counter-revolution dedicated to the old order of capitalism, there will naturally be no press at all—such is the liberalism of Bolshevism.

In the same frank way Lenine went on to speak of the conduct of the campaign, the arming of the proletariat and the disarming of the bourgeoisie, and the gradual return after the elimination of the bourgeoisie to a condition of democracy based on political divisions within the proletariat. "Civil war is civil war. It writes its own laws. Either the proletariat rules or capital rules. There is no other alternative. . . . The idea of annihilating capitalism without civil war is Utopian. . . . We must keep the dictatorship in order to control the bourgeoisie. . . . But as time passes and the majority becomes assured of its power we can raise the question of general suffrage before the Soviet." This is certainly an uncompromising and undemocratic doctrine—full of purpose and power, no doubt, but bare and hard. The reception which has been accorded to it by the old world order has perhaps done more to commend it than have its own achievements; and that the old world order has recorded more failures than successes at Paris is now pretty generally recognized. For all this, however, Lenine has an answer—the more forcible because he remains quietly at his capital, holds his ground, and sticks to his ideas. The fact that no one in Paris has another answer to oppose to his does not, of course, mean that his answer is the right one, but his consistency in both action and words gives him weight. It is now plain that whether one likes or dislikes the man, approves or disapproves of him, if such a striking personality must continue to be dealt with by Governments as well as by individuals, no obstacle ought to be put in the way of the widest dissemination of the truth about him.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Court Martial on Trial

IT is no new quarrel, this, about the court-martial system. The only surprising thing about it all is that this ancient institution should have found so many to praise and uphold it. That many of our generals would extol it we had expected; they know no other system and it has always been the custom of the regular army to praise its own—particularly in the days when it was entirely ignorant of any other military systems or practices. But that so distinguished a teacher of law as Professor John H. Wigmore should declare, in his testimony of last week, that our military judicial procedure is not only not archaic but contains "elements so advanced and modern that men in civil practice can only dream of the day when they will be applied in the civil courts" is, we confess, so startling as to lead us to reexamine a judgment formed long ago.

The evil characteristics of the system seem to us numerous. While the court-martial procedure itself is a direct inheritance from the Roman law, the court martial was an effort to assure to the soldier the right of trial by a jury. More than that, it was meant to be a jury of his peers in accordance with English custom; our court-martial system, like our articles of war, is an inheritance from England. Of course it could not be a trial by the soldier's peers. Such a concession the military system, based as it is on caste, could not tolerate: the soldier must be tried by his superiors. The system does give an officer a trial by his peers, but even here it has its limitations in practice. If it were merely a question of trying officers there would be little complaint, particularly as Lieutenant-Colonel Samuel T. Ansell, who has bravely attempted to reform the existing system, declares that the records show that only thirty-six per cent. of the officers tried are convicted. But it is the other side of the shield that appals us, for Colonel Ansell states that ninety per cent. of the soldiers brought before courts are at once convicted.

Even when officers are tried, however, the risk of a miscarriage has been far greater in a military court than in a civilian court. Take the case of Captain Oberlin M. Carter of the Engineers Corps, which was a *cause célèbre* nineteen years ago. There was no doubt that Captain Carter was guilty, and also no question that he had been convicted by a procedure which if it had been followed in a civilian court would have resulted in a reversal of the judgment. There have been plenty of cases since this war began in which men have been convicted upon improperly introduced evidence, sometimes wholly as the result of the passion of the hour. This, the defenders of the court-martial system point out, is due not to the system but to the men who work it. We admit that there is a distinction here; yet the very fact that courts martial are run by men who rarely are trained lawyers is the very reason why the system should be made as fool-proof as possible. A very distinguished Secretary of War once remarked to us that the trouble with courts martial was that they did not convict—just as survey boards did not survey. He, too, was speaking of the trial of officers; the figures show that the charge could not lie in the case of enlisted men.

The chief weakness of the courts martial, aside from the legal ignorance of those composing them, is the anomalous position of the judge advocate, who not only explains the rules of evidence and procedure, but also prosecutes "in the name of the United States." Under the old articles of war which were revised only three years ago, the judge advocate was compelled to "so far consider himself counsel for the prisoner as to object to any leading question to any of the witnesses and to any question to the prisoner the answer to which might tend to incriminate himself." He was thus judge, attorney for the prosecution, and to an extent counsel for the prisoner. The latter power gave him the right to obtain knowledge in advance of the prisoner's evidence, which knowledge he could then turn to his own advantage when he reassumed the rôle of public prosecutor. In Germany there used to be two civilian members upon every court-martial in order to prevent miscarriages of justice. They were usually men versed in the law.

Legal knowledge is more than can be claimed for most of the officers who as judge advocates have conducted courts martial in the United States, and it is here that the great weakness of the courts has resided in peace times. Thus, in the Carter case such extraordinary rulings were made by the late General Elwell S. Otis as president of the court that one of the foremost New York lawyers declared the whole proceeding to be "a most shocking travesty of justice." The action of a naval judge advocate, who admitted evidence that was "hearsay upon hearsay" although he knew that simple hearsay was debarred, could be paralleled by many occurrences in the army. In this naval case the prisoner was confined three months on board ship and nine months in a navy yard as a result of this extraordinary ruling. In another case a soldier was sent to prison for years because an officer who had just begun the study of law declared that certain evidence was admissible, whereas the slightest reference to the books on evidence would have shown it to be entirely improper. It is very gratifying, therefore, to read that, despite the clash between Colonel Ansell and the committee of the Bar Association, its chairman, Judge S. S. Gregory, has announced that among the changes he will advocate are the following:

> The appointment of a qualified legal officer as presiding judge of courts martial, to rule upon all law questions; the requirement of a unanimous verdict by the court in all death sentences, o those involving dishonorable discharge or more than two years' imprisonment; the creation of a system of trial of commissioned officers before courts composed of commissioned officers, and of enlisted men before what would in practice be juries of enlisted men, with a qualified officer presiding as judge; the creation of a power for the revision of findings and sentences for legal error, to be lodged in the War Department; and, finally, promulgation of verdicts of acquittal in open court, with immediate release of the defendants.

If these far-reaching reforms, which make it more than ever difficult to understand Professor Wigmore's quoted remarks, are promptly enacted into law, there will be a wonderful change for the better, but there must be as well a general release of many thousands of the prisoners who have already been given ferocious sentences. More than that, the provision of the articles of war which, on the outbreak of war, terminates all restrictions upon the length of sentences by courts martial should be immediately done away with. Whatever the outcome, Lieutenant-Colonel Ansell is surely entitled to the thanks of the country for his courage, his wisdom, and his patriotic readiness to sacrifice himself and his career, if need be, to bring about this reform. We believe that he will be acclaimed by hundreds of thousands who have seen the evil workings of this system during their service abroad.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prophecy

NEVER till now, in the history of an Earth which to this hour nowhere refuses to grow corn if you will plow it, to yield shirts, if you will spin and weave in it, did the mere manual two-handed worker (however it might fare with other workers) cry in vain for such wages as *he* means by "fair wages," namely food and warmth! . . . Why, the four-footed worker has already *got* all that this two-handed one is clamoring for! . . . There is not a horse in England, able and willing to work, but *has* due food and lodging; and goes about sleek-coated, satisfied in heart. And you say, It is impossible. Brothers, I answer, if for you it is impossible, what is to become of you? It is impossible for us to believe it to be impossible.

Thus wrote Carlyle seventy-five years ago in words still applicable to the times; and the "impossible," whether or no still thought of as such, is nevertheless yet unrealized. Had Carlyle in his old age chanced upon Samuel Butler's "Erewhon," his prophetic soul would have rejoiced in the chapters on "machines," which argue half seriously the dominance of the machine over men, but which have become too near a picture of reality in the subsequent half century to be longer thought of as merely a *jeu d'esprit*. Are we not already, as Butler fancifully predicted, little more than aphids to the enslaving race of machines, suffered to live because of our service to them: humble bees essential to their fertilization and procreation. The worker, truly, now sees in the machine a more formidable enemy than in his traditional oppressor, the employer; for it is the machine that, usurping his skill and robbing his right hand of its cunning, yet makes him dependent upon it for very life. Against the machine he wars, crippling it in so far as he dares, matching his craft in sabotage against its tireless might. Society shoots and imprisons the syndicalist for so doing, being itself so subservient to the machine that it is in terror at the thought of revolt.

Machinery of all kinds may, however, destroy itself if society lack courage to control it; may break in pieces like a fly-wheel from its own increasing momentum. The machinery of coöperative industry, of credit, and finally of guns, battleships, planes, and explosives all but destroyed the victors in the recent war no less than the vanquished; has, perhaps, already done so, had we eyes to see clearly. Henry Adams selected the year 1938 as the date of the *débâcle*; yet his prediction may have been too conservative. For the force of machines accelerates mathematically, doubling each decade, says Adams, whereas the moral forces of mankind, by which alone it can be controlled, accelerate more slowly, if at all. The world becomes daily more of a vast powder plant, a power-house of stupendous forces wherein a few selfish fools or reckless workmen may at any moment bring on irretrievable disaster.

The business of prophecy demands a certain steadfastness, a refusal to be blinded by the extrinsic, a faith that spiritual laws cannot forever be flouted with impunity, that a people which flies in the face of Providence must sometime suffer the fate of Nineveh and Tyre. With this proviso—sufficiently rare perhaps—prophecy is no difficult matter, if it be not too hazardously explicit in its terms, and if it be blessed with a wealth of historical precedents wherewith to weight its conclusions. The Christian world has always preferred the Old Testament to the New as a guide to conduct, but what has it ever learned from the prophetic books relating the fall of kings and peoples? It is the teaching of the prophets that no nation endures which is not just. Nor can the law be less operative today, though the modern man, with his childish faith in his dynamos and battleships, is incredulous that this is so.

Foolish men imagine that because judgment for an evil thing is delayed, there is no justice but an accidental one here below. Judgment for an evil thing is many times delayed some day or two, some century or two, but it is sure as life, it is sure as death! In the centre of the world-whirlwind, verily now as in the oldest days, dwells and speaks a God. The great soul of the world is *just*.

Yet to know what justice is, even when desirous of it, is not easy. Carlyle, if eloquent, is not specific upon the point, though with suggestive gleams from which profit is derivable:

"What is Justice?" The clothed embodied justice that sits in Westminster Hall, with penalties, parchments, tipstaves, is very visible. But the *un*embodied Justice, whereof that other is either an emblem, or else is a fearful indescribability, is not so visible. For the unembodied Justice is of Heaven; a spirit, and Divinity of Heaven,—*in*visible to all but the noble and pure of soul. The impure ignoble gaze with eyes and she is not there. They will prove it to you by logic, by endless Hansard debatings, by bursts of Parliamentary eloquence. It is not consolatory to behold! For properly, as many men as there are in a nation who *can* withal see Heaven's invisible Justice, and know it to be on earth also omnipotent, so many men are there who stand between a nation and perdition. So many, and no more . . . The Supreme Power sends new and ever new, all *born* at least with hearts of flesh and not of stone;—and heavy Misery itself, once heavy enough, will prove didactic!

Misery enough the world knows today, weighty to prove the fact of justice flouted. And meanwhile we have parliamentary eloquence of its kind and little else. Yet where now is the prophet to wrap his mantle about him and confront any legislative body in the world, pointing with minatory finger to the clock above the Speaker's head: "So many circuits of the dial and no more. Look on the human misery about you, and seek to do away with it. Forget your parties, your preferments, and the slavish bidding of your masters. Delay, and there will come a greater change than you dream, and you and your ways will be forgotten."

A prophet so rashly inspired, had he time to utter so much before being expelled by the sergeant-at-arms, would doubtless be dragged to the police court, there to be pronounced insane by the alienist, or committed as a "Bolshevik," along with many and lesser prophets, to one of our capacious prisons. And yet the solemn words of the prophet Isaiah still warn us that we shall find safety only in justice:

For thou hast trusted in thy wickedness: thou hast said, None seeth me. Thy wisdom and thy knowledge it hath perverted thee; and thou hast said in thine heart, I am and none beside me.

Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let now the astrologers, the stargazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from these things that shall come upon thee.

None calleth for justice, nor any pleadeth for truth: they trust in vanity and speak lies; they conceive mischief, and bring forth iniquity.

Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood: their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity; wasting and destruction are in their paths.

The way of peace they know not; and there is no judgment in their goings: they have made them crooked paths: whoever goeth therein shall not know peace.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Communists in Bavaria

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

I MET Dr. Max Levien, the Russian Communist who has been one of the leaders in the establishment of a Bolshevist Government in Munich, on the night of the 28th of February. It was on that afternoon that a group of men entered the Landtag building and made all of us who were attending the meeting of the Workmen's, Peasants', and Soldiers' Council stand with our hands in the air, at the point of revolvers, while they took Dr. Levien, Erich Muehsam, and one other out to beat them with revolvers and to threaten them with death. So stupid was this procedure that it was perfectly obvious that the reaction must give Levien increased authority and power. There is no doubt that he could have declared a Soviet republic that day and won over the working men to him had he felt himself strong enough to do so. As I watched this singular personality after he had had his bandages renewed, I could not but feel that, repulsive as he was to me, he had only to wait to have the situation play into his hands. I had just telegraphed that afternoon to Colonel House and Herbert Hoover that a Bolshevist dictatorship would be established in Munich in April if food were not forthcoming at once, and the more I studied Levien the more certain I was of the correctness of the prophecy, which time has completely justified, for the dictatorship was set up on the fifteenth day of April.

Of the other Bolshevist leaders, perhaps the two most interesting were Muehsam and Gustav Landauer, both journalists. It was the latter who made the address at the funeral of Eisner. Both are long-haired visionaries whom Eisner alone could have held in check. I heard a man say that instead of beating Landauer and Muehsam or arresting them they could be shorn of their power, like Samson, if their long locks and beards were removed and their picturesqueness destroyed. But there was no doubt of the ability of Landauer. He spoke well at the meetings of the Soviet which I attended, and so did Muehsam, who was as calm and collected as Levien after the extraordinary experience to which they were subjected on the 28th of February. The truth is that these men were more determined and united and more aggressive than any other group. They could have been held in check then had the other side had any leadership, but the curse of the situation was that with the death of Eisner there was no man left upon whom the moderates could unite. It was just because of this that the assassination of Eisner was so utterly stupid from the point of view of the propertied classes. It left the way open for men with the brute force of Levien and the fanaticism of Landauer and Muehsam to seize the leadership.

What I cannot understand, however, is how they have been able to bring to their extreme point of view others who were quite opposed to them at the beginning of March. There was Ernst Toller, for instance, a young idealist, whom I first met at the Internationale in Berne, where he was thoroughly dissatisfied because that body was not as radical nor as sympathetic with the Russians as he wished. Toller's opportunity came after Eisner's death, when he made some excellent addresses counselling calmness. When the attack was made upon Levien and Muehsam it was Toller who insisted that these men must be brought back, that the Parliamentary immunity of the Soviet must be preserved at any cost, and he was of the committee that went out to bring them back. He was himself a pacifist and absolutely opposed to the use of force, and yet he whole heartedly joined the extremists who have brought about the present terrible conditions in Munich, and was for two weeks with Dr. Neurath, the brains of the Communist Government, until he fled the city. I am astounded, too, that an officer like Major Ernst Paraquin, who, with his brother, fought all through the war, should now be one of five officers of the old army who are drilling and organizing the Red Guard. While both brothers are Socialists, they have the highest social connections, and they were both utterly opposed to the Bolshevist idea. Whether they have yielded to the inevitable, or whether they have been convinced that there is nothing left to do but join those in power and serve, as far as possible, as moderating influences I do not know. One of the bourgeoisie said that he did not expect any of his class to be alive within two years.

Early in March the conservatives were counting upon the peasants to save the day for Bavaria. There was a certain Herr Gandorfer, a man of striking personality and obvious force and power, who was the leader of the peasants in the Soviet, in which body he often spoke out in opposition to the views of the extremists. "As long as Gandorfer sticks we are safe," was the remark on every side; and later, in Berlin, I was again told that the Communists could get no hold on Bavaria because the peasants with their small landholdings would inevitably be opposed to communistic doctrines. This I could not believe, for I had already seen a dispatch, too startling to print, in the office of one of the Berlin newspapers, which reported that the peasants in Württemberg, up to that time the quietest portion of Germany, were "entirely undermined" by the Bolshevist doctrines. It has already appeared that Gandorfer went over to the opposing camp with his large following. This is all the more remarkable because the peasantry of Bavaria is devotedly Catholic, and the church influence has been steadily against the Bolshevist movement, in fact against the revolution. One of the first acts of Eisner was to separate church from state, and when he was killed the Soviet compelled every Catholic church, as well as every Protestant, to ring its bells for an hour during the funeral of Eisner, in honor of this Jew who had dealt the church such a blow. Where the Catholic authorities refused to obey, the populace blew down the church doors with hand grenades and rang the bells themselves.

Why should Bavaria, the most conservative and most reactionary of the German States, have been with the exception of Brunswick the first to go to such extremes? It is a difficult question to answer. The greater the repression, the more violent the reaction when the explosion comes, and there is no doubt that Bavaria was sufficiently repressed and quite too strongly controlled by its priesthood. It had long had the highest percentage of illegitimate births of any State in the German Empire, because of the difficulties thrown by the church and the state in the way of marriage. But, next to this, one comes back invariably to the fact that the Soviet leaders are what the Germans called *tatkräftige Menschen*, that is, men "capable of deeds."

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Wilson and the Italians

(By Cable to the *Nation*)

Paris, April 26

THERE is new life in the Hotel Crillon today and a fresh wind blowing through the Peace Conference. After months of silence and isolation Wilson has for once opened the doors and windows. For once he has had resource to his political intelligence. The Italian issue has come up at intervals ever since the Peace Conference opened more than three months ago. During that time the British and French have declared that they would honor their signatures to the Treaty of London if Italy really insisted upon her pound of flesh, but they have also consistently urged her to effect a compromise with the Jugoslavs. None the less the Italians have persisted in their policy of provocation, have occupied Fiume, which was given to them neither by the Treaty of London nor by the terms of the armistice, and have isolated it from its Slavic industrial suburbs.

President Wilson's attitude has been so evident from the beginning that it could not be a surprise to Orlando. Mr. Wilson attempted until the very eve of the arrival of the German delegates, to bring the Italians to reason and only then called the public to witness as he might have done, and perhaps should have done, much earlier. His triumphant passage through Italy gave Mr. Wilson an immense popular prestige which has waned steadily with the months of waiting. All through the winter there was keen discontent with the present Government of Italy among the Italians, which has been diverted and prevented from coming to a head by careful and extremely intensive propaganda for national expansion. Our latest advices here indicate that the Government has been successful in this, and has induced the Italian people to believe that they really care about the annexation of Slavic Dalmatia. It is understood that the President has no special information on which to base any hopes that his outspokenness may overturn the Orlando Government. On the other hand, it is quite possible that Orlando may find that his propaganda has brought the country to a point where he will be unable to control the public excitement and to make the compromise which he is now understood to desire.

Since Mr. Wilson came to France the Italian conservative groups have dropped even the pretence of lip-respect to the President and have developed a frank hostility to him, while the Socialists have shifted from enthusiasm to suspicion. Protests against Mr. Debs's imprisonment fill columns formerly devoted to praise of the President, while *Avanti*, the Italian Socialist daily, recently ran a series of display articles on "The White Terror in America," referring to the hundreds of imprisonments of Industrial Workers of the World and their unbelievably long jail sentences. *L'Humanité*, the French official daily of the Socialist party, yesterday concluded a lukewarm appreciation of the President's statement with a sarcastic comment on the increase of the American garrisons in the Pacific, and this morning Marcel Sembat asked: "President Wilson, why have you waited so long? Did you have no reason to intervene before Fiume? Do you not see great standing armies forming despite your promises? Have not furious appetites for conquest been awakened and stirred? Why did you not appeal sooner to that conscience of the peoples which lent you so much force? Why have you permitted us to be set back into the régime of secret diplomacy?" One disillusioned American member of the official staff at the Hotel Crillon says: "It is like a man who has permitted his mother to be shot, protesting against the shooting of his boy." Meanwhile, André Chéradame in *La Democratie Nouvelle*, Auguste Gauvain in the *Journal des Débats*, and certain other conservatives steadily defend the President's action and favor the Jugoslavs, so that, despite the yelping of the *Echo de Paris*, the *Matin* and the *Figaro*, the President may still have the benefit of continued French governmental support.

The Italian departure must not be taken too seriously, for a majority of the delegation is still in Paris and Italian officials continued to sit on economic commissions until the printing of the fact in the newspapers today forced them, in consistency, to retire. They are too much interested in the shipment of coal and food to Italy not to maintain a close relationship with the Allies. There is much pretended fear at the Hotel Edouard Sept, the Italian headquarters in Paris, that somebody might think that the Italians have not really left the Peace Conference.

The substance of Mr. Wilson's statement, which was composed three days before its publication, was known in official circles long before, and Orlando had his passports ready for his return before Mr. Wilson wrote his message. Plainly the implications of the statement are world-wide, for the Japanese commissioners are understood to have had instructions from Tokio to return if Tsingtao was not granted to them. But Japan will have the opportunity for further correspondence and discussion before a decisive step is taken. Many French pro-Polish writers note the parallel to Danzig in this Fiume matter and have said that Mr. Wilson's action must give Danzig to Poland. Wilsonian circles in reply refuse to admit the aptitude of the parallel and point out that Fiume lies in a solidly Slavic matrix and that its cession to the Jugoslavs does not involve cutting Italy in two. There is also a possible application of the Fiume situation to certain French claims.

Whatever may be the outcome, the Peace Conference is at last interesting again and the result cannot be any worse than the entirely imperialistic peace which a few days ago seemed inevitable. The American Peace Commissioners who have recently been so despondent now feel that the situation at least has possibilities, that the President has saved his face and may save more than that. He has recovered a certain freedom of action or else has changed his policy, for this morning he invited a group of French workingmen to call upon him who several months ago named their producers' coöperative society "La Wilsonienne." He was very cordial to them and to Jean Longuet, the Socialist editor and leader, who acted as their interpreter. This was his first direct contact with French workers since the day of his arrival in France. Does it foretell a last desperate change of policy on his part?

Finally, America must not forget that food remains more important than boundaries. Mr. Hoover, I am sorry to say, seems to have no interest in the Nansen plan of feeding Soviet Russia and new red tape obstructions to the plan are unrolled daily. Meanwhile officials here talk coolly and calmly of three hundred thousand deaths a month in Russia because of the blockade—as if the responsibility did not rest upon them.

LEWIS S. GANNETT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Alternative in Italy

By KENNETH DURANT

THE name of Wilson is written upon the walls of Rome —not yet, to be sure, graven in enduring stone with the names of popes and cæsars, but lightly scribbled in chalk and pencil. "W. Wilson." One other name and only one other, I found written in equal profusion: "N. Lenine." The two names, two ways; the choice—or is it the dilemma?—of a hesitating civilization.

Turning from the walls to the men of Rome, I sought to trace the source of these writings. I found three views of Wilson in three types of Roman mind. Generally the upper levels of the borghese, the café chatterers, small officials, officers, and journalists were frankly cynical. They did not believe in this idealist nor in his schemes for a new world. They wanted to know what America expected to get out of the war, and insisted that the President's utterances did not reveal our selfish aims. But among the great mass of the Italian workers, however, and also of the lesser bourgeois, there was infinite trust and hope. To them America was still the "new world" and it seemed natural to them that out of the famed land of riches and liberty should have come the prophet of peace and democracy.

There was a deeper emotion than curiosity in the eager crowd that gathered to see and hear the President in the Piazza Venezia on the afternoon of his arrival in Rome. When the papers announced, on the authority of American officials, that Mr. Wilson would address the people at four o'clock they came to the Piazza Venezia long before the hour and waited patiently, in vain, until after dark for the great peace-bringer. It is said that President Wilson was bitterly chagrined that press of official visits prevented him from keeping this appointment with the Roman people.

The third opinion of Mr. Wilson was that held by the Italian Socialists—respectful but skeptical. They had a certain honest admiration for Wilson which they did not concede to any other bourgeois statesman. Moreover many of his public expressions were useful to their propaganda. But the Italian Socialists did not believe that Mr. Wilson would succeed in making good his fairest words. Only the revolution, they said, can accomplish what Wilson promises, and the Socialists do not believe that Wilson is a revolutionist. And so Italian revolutionary socialism caps the name of Wilson with the name of Lenine in the writing upon the walls of Rome.

Of these three views of Wilson the cynicism of the borghese is the most important at the present moment. The future will be determined between the aspirations of the people which are drawn upon his name and the skepticism of the Socialists who have chosen another leader. The present—perhaps only the immediate present—is in the hands of the "select classes" who, despite Mr. Wilson, do rule Italy today. There was no excuse for America to have overlooked or misunderstood Italian imperialism. All winter Italian capitalists have been eager to make their case clearly known—especially to Americans. Any Italian banker would explain how by holding the Dalmatian coast, which is the key to the Mediterranean, Italy will be able to reduce, or perhaps even abolish her armaments. All such talk runs swiftly to its central theme: the intolerable jealousy and ambition of France. But Italy is determined to be independent of France. If France will not be friends, if France continues to support Jugoslav nationalism—and if America and England are foolish enough to follow her in this course—then Italy will be forced back into the arms of Germany. Moreover there is still much German capital invested in Italy and an influential section of Italian interests is impatient for a resumption of intimate commercial relations with Germany. The argument proceeds cautiously from this point, carefully measuring the sensibilities of the American listener, whose quaint pose of international idealism must not be offended. But with a little encouragement you draw out the following: If France attempts to thwart Italian ambitions Italy will ally herself with Germany and the central European States. Italy does not wish to desert France and England and America. She is especially devoted to America. But she will no longer submit to French commercial domination. Italy must have coal and iron. Formerly she got these from Germany. Now France, recovering Alsace-Lorraine and reaching out for the valley of the Saare, takes Germany's richest mines and threatens thus more firmly to establish her industrial supremacy. Italy will not submit.

Italy, the tale runs, would be glad to continue in friendship with France, but she will not let France control her supplies of raw materials and at the same time thwart her national expansion on the Adriatic. Possession of the Dalmatian coast is essential to Italian freedom. It is a strategic necessity. Italy must be mistress of the Adriatic in order to establish her control of the Mediterranean. Racial determination is irrelevant to Dalmatia. The Dalmatian Slavs have always been under foreign domination and it is their fate to continue so.

So spoke the controlling classes of Italy, speaking with proud confidence in the industrial future of their nation and expressing their determination to assure that future by any means and at all costs in the present redistribution of power in Europe. So they talked very openly to Americans, with many an insidious plea for American capital to enter and participate in the development of Italy's great industrial and commercial future. If German penetration was to be checked, American capital must provide a substitute. Thus spoke, last January, the most powerful men in Italy.

The most disturbing element in the violent anti-French propaganda, which has been conspicuous in Italy all winter, is the menacing notion which actually seems to prevail in many Italian minds that Italy can defeat France in war. Then Germany, with her ambition unsubdued—is ready to reëstablish the Triple Alliance. Italy's future is assured. It is only for her to decide who are her true friends.

They told me in Rome that the Italian peasants burned candles before the enshrined portraits of Mr. Wilson. I could believe the tale. The faith of the people in him approached adoration, and this simple reverence would have been natural to them. I did not see any of these altars to democracy and peace. But I observed in Rome that the picture of the Madonna in street corner shrines was protected by heavy wire netting and that the light before the sacred image was generally electric and unlighted. The time was evidently ripe for the arrival of new gods. There was deep significance in the solemn expectancy of the crowd which waited so patiently in the Piazza Venezia for the man who never came. The Italian Government did itself an ill service when it prevented that rendezvous. For the Italian people have, be it noted, more than one choice. There are two names written on the walls of Rome.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Correspondence

I. Red Flags in Paris

Paris, April 7

RED flags as far as the eye could see, hung with crêpe; tens of thousands of men and women and children, scarlet badges in their buttonholes, marching in a cloud of dust, sometimes silent, sometimes choralling the Internationale or chanting "Vive Jaurès!," or, in an uglier tone, barking "Hou! Hou! Clemenceau!"—these are the people of Paris paying tribute to the memory and ideals of Jaurès.

Three hundred thousand of them by the reckoning of the Socialist daily *L'Humanité*; one hundred and twenty thousand by the count of its bitterest journalistic opponent; thirty thousand according to the police. The confessed assassin of Jaurès had been acquitted—Jaurès, the greatest orator of modern France, the beloved leader of the French working class, the man to whom half of Europe looked in those last desperate hours when war still hung in the balance—shot down by a young royalist, July 31, 1914. A jury—three gentlemen of private income, one veterinary surgeon, one merchant, two factory-owners, a proprietor of a printing shop, a proprietor of a marble works, two commercial travellers and one clerk—without a single man who worked with his hands, acquitted the murderer on March 29, three weeks after Cottin, the young anarchist who shot at Clemenceau, had been sentenced to death.

It was a wistful Sunday afternoon of early spring, and whole families came out to march. There were fathers who had "toted" their children for many a weary mile; there were six-year-olds sturdily stretching their legs to keep up with their elders; women in fur coats and women with shawls over their heads—all marching through the broad Avenue Henri Martin to honor the leader killed five years before and to protest against what they called the "class verdict" acquitting his murderer.

The parade was more a peaceful family promenade in honor of a friend than the menacing demonstration that had been feared. There were no bands, none of the holiday aspects of an American parade. French people do not easily regiment themselves in demonstrations. On the rare occasions when they are fused into the mood for massed processions they do not care for bands and marching music. "Only twice in my life have I seen so many people marching through the streets," a gray-haired Frenchwoman told me. The hundred Socialist Deputies led the uneven ranks. Half way up the avenue they turned down a narrow side-street and off that into a still narrower alley, to the tiny house where Jaurès lived, to pay homage to his wife and daughter. With the Deputies walked General Percin, and Anatole France, who got up from a sick-bed to march; and behind them a trail of simple workingmen streamed through the house. The alley was too narrow for the thousands and the procession went on down the Avenue Henri Martin, a rich man's avenue, miles from the slums of northeastern Paris. You could see faces, half frightened, half curious, peering down upon the endless mass with the red flags standing up like masts in a harbor packed with ships.

Half way up the avenue a bust of Jaurès had been set up and draped in crimson bunting. Mothers lifted their children high to see it as they passed by. Men tossed their hats skyward. Blue-clad poilus ran out and pinned their precious *croix de guerre* and *medailles militaires* upon the decorated bust of the man who, they believed, had he lived, might have prevented the war. Before the day was done Jaurès wore fifty war crosses and military medals, the badge of the Legion of Honor, and half a dozen *fourragères*.

Painfully hobbling came the Federation of War Cripples. A dozen limping men bore on their left arms the V which indicated that they still were hospital patients. A few had ghastly made-over faces that were probably the pride of some famous surgeon, but each wore a scarlet poppy in his buttonhole. Then came a group of shabby collarless workingmen, some of them in baggy corduroys, followed by boys of the class of '20, saved from carnage by the armistice.

The printers, the paper-box makers, the hat-makers; the barbers, the dockers, the carpenters, masons, jewelers, electricians, metal-workers, leather-workers, glass-workers—the trade-unions of Paris passed, each with its own red flag, sometimes in solemn silence, sometimes crying all the cries of revolution:

"Vive Lenine! Vive Trotz-keee!"

"A bas la guerre!"

"Revolu-tion! Revolu-tion!" in metronomic repetition. And the sinister bark of that "Hou! Hou! Clemenceau!" or the sudden surge of "Vive Jau-rès!"

The railwaymen were led by the men of the P-L-M who made the famous one-minute strike in January when every train on the line stopped still at noon. A little black-eyed girl in a flaming liberty-cap, mounted on her father's shoulder, held the banner of the section of Surennes.

An uproarious little group of anarchists howled "Vive Cot-tin" (Clemenceau's would-be assassin) to the full strength of their libertarian lungs. They and the police were responsible for the only riots of the day—first, when the police suppressed their great black flag; later, at the end of the line of march, when the police tried to seize their transparencies ornamented with phrases from Clemenceau's youth, when the Premier was half an anarchist himself. It was a tribute to the free spirit of liberty in France that they were allowed to march and cry "Vive Cottin"—or else a tribute of respect to the masses.

The theatres had gone dark for fifteen minutes as the parade started, when the stage electricians struck in tribute to Jaurès; the audiences knew why, for the directors had been forewarned that the darkness would continue until its significance was explained from the stage. Except for the anarchists and a bit of stone-throwing when someone hung out the tri-colored flag of Clemenceau's France for a few minutes, there was no trouble in the city, and the thousands streamed home in peace. At Brest, Nantes, Lyons, Marseilles, Nancy, and dozens of lesser towns the red flag was unfurled and paraded through the city streets. There were red buttonhole bouquets in the Sunday crowds all over France that night.

What did it mean? Was it a foretoken of revolution rising in France as in the countries east of the Rhine? A family procession on a warm spring Sunday afternoon, lacking the bitterness of revolution, it yet was one of the four great red-flag parades of Paris since the Commune fifty years ago. But revolution will not stir in France until in disillusionment and disintegration she faces the bankruptcy that is still staved off by American loans. Then the crowds beneath the red flags may swell and Paris papers may report more of what they are pleased to call "incidents."

LEWIS S. GANNETT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. The Fighting Services in England

Manchester, England, April 9

THE estimates for 1919-1920 are out and the Englishman may be pardoned if he is a little bewildered and disgruntled by the Government's policy towards the Army, the Navy, and the air force—perhaps one should not say policy but lack of it, except for the army. Mr. Churchill is neither bewildered nor disgruntled. On the contrary he is immensely in his element. He is about among the soldiers, as busy as a bee among the flowers, organizing an army of occupation for the Rhine, another for the garrisons in India and the possessions overseas, another for the permanent forces of the future, and a fourth for some other purpose.

In the army estimates we have really something to bite on and there are many people who do not like the taste. We have an Army of Occupation on the Rhine which is to be maintained by conscription, and conscription is cordially disliked. The British Electorate as a whole voted in December to exact the cost of the war from Germany. Those who will the end must will the means. Few persons of intelligence believe that it could be humanly possible to wring these enormous indemnities from Germany, but at least those who voted for it ought to have sense to admit that it could only be done by a prolonged occupation of German provinces and that only by conscription could such an army of occupation be maintained. It is difficult to be patient with those who, having demanded a vindictive peace, expect to obtain its fruits with a neat little voluntary army.

The Government deserves some sympathy. For the present, at least, an army of occupation is necessary. That being so, those responsible for it must be able to rely on a sufficiently numerous and efficient force. Would they be able to do so by a purely voluntary appeal, accompanied by further inducements in respect of pay? At the end of November an appeal was made for volunteers for the new army to relieve the garrisons overseas. Enlistments were to be for two, three, or four years and special bonuses were offered. At the beginning of March only 45,000 men had been recruited for this army. Remove compulsion from the Army of the Rhine and no one can say how many, or how few, men could be obtained for it by voluntary means during the next year.

The true remedy is to make peace quickly and to make it on fair terms. Peace having been made, we want the Army of Occupation brought home and conscription abolished with all speed. Then we can substitute for it the small voluntary army which we hope will supply all our needs under the new régime. But we hear little enough of it. Germany is to have an army of no more than 70,000 men. And a very good thing for Germany, too—a boon from the Danai, indeed, if she but knew it! With no hindrance but a small volunteer army, Germany can now spend on useful, productive works all that energy and brain-power which she lavished on her military machine. But what of the Allies? Are they also to share the benefit? Mr. Lloyd George, it is said, is for destroying conscription in Germany in order that it may be destroyed throughout all Europe. But the *Echo de Paris* the other day had this to say about it: "There is danger in the illusion which may spread among the masses in Allied countries that they also can disarm." It is true; the "illusion" will certainly spread. As for England, we admit the necessity of a compulsory Army of Occupation for the present. But if any one, whether in France or elsewhere, supposes that as a permanent policy, and with Germany disarmed, we are going to continue conscription, he does not know the present temper of the British people.

Still, we have an army policy as well as a bill to pay. In the case of the navy it is all bill and no policy. (The Bill, by the way, is £149,000,000.) Literally we have not the ghost of an idea what our naval policy is about to be. We do not even know exactly what is the present strength of the navy in its different branches, nor what vessels of each type are building in the shipyards, nor what general policy, if any, the Government will propose to the Allies, nor what it intends to do if its policy, being proposed, is not accepted by them. We surmise that the Admiralty is in favor of an all-round reduction in the standard of naval strength among the Powers because we know that it opposes the addition of the German ships to the existing fleets. We know also, because we have just been told, that the British battle-fleet consists of forty-two dreadnought battleships and battle cruisers. The fleets of the Central Powers, and in particular that of Germany, having been wiped out, and a League of Nations having been secured, it would seem reasonable to agree on a sweeping proportionate reduction in naval armaments. We may as well be frank about the result. It would necessitate the breaking up of a large part of the British fleet as useless.

Meanwhile it is about time that we heard more of our Government's intentions. Germany is to be forbidden to keep more than a very modest fleet. But the French are pressing for a share of the surrendered German warships, which does not suggest an inclination to cut down the general standard drastically. One wonders whether the silence of the British Government is due to a preoccupation with more pressing things or conceals a timidity to handle boldly so delicate a subject. Mr. Long, the First Lord, has made a speech on the naval estimates without saying anything, but he might do that at any time, so no inference can be drawn. For the present, we maintain and we pay for a super-navy of gigantic size which has no enemy to fight or fear, and apparently we cannot "get without" it, as they say in Lancashire.

The position with regard to the air force is not very different. We have been hearing for some time that the Allies in Paris will forbid Germany to maintain a military air force of any kind. The French are so much impressed by the danger that some of them, like the brothers Michelin, are in favor of forbidding Germany to have even commercial aeroplanes. But what difference will be made in our air policy by the abolition of military aeronautics in Germany? We may guess but we do not know.

But in all these things the civilian mind is groping in the dark; his leaders offer him no guidance. He cannot but welcome the suggestion that the German strength in army, fleet, and aeroplanes should be reduced to a minimum, provided this means not only that Germany should be deprived of the means of possible aggression, but also that on her deprivation the other great Powers intend to base their own release from crushing armaments. If it should not be so, if the idea should be to disarm Germany but at the same time to maintain the armaments of the European Allies on a large scale, then we should have taken the surest way to our own injury, both immediate and ultimate. We live on hopes of a future that we cannot divine while we pay heavily for a present that we do not understand.

W. P. CROZIER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Habit of Torture*

By EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER

WHEREVER primitive society is discerned, even dimly, there is cruelty also. With primitive people it lingers down to the present time; there is torture or frightful vengeance from the fury of the African savage or the island chieftain in forgotton wastes of the sea. Diminishing slowly, it accompanies the upward progress of men. As early civilization begins, fearful punishments remain to the prerogative of the ruler or receive sanction of codified law. The penalties meted out by Assyrian potentates still start from the tablets of Koyunjik and Nimrud to affright the curious in museums. In Italy the servile revolts produced unnumbered crosses, each with its wretch nailed upon it. Along the Barbary coast Moorish tyrants once impaled offenders upon great hooks high up in the city walls, and a certain one has painted a picture of the throng who flocked outside to see the unhappy miscreants in their hopeless and lingering torment. Seldom has there been a nation whose people did not witness and approve unutterable horror. Civilization striving to emerge from the lawless times when it began, power struggling to maintain itself, gave awful punishments as warning to disobedient or transgressors. For rebels in the east, let their throats be choked up with dust, let them be impaled. For those who counterfeited the king's coin in the Middle Ages, let them die slowly in boiling oil. For women who murdered their husbands, let them be burned alive. For those who cheated the customs in France, let them be broken upon the wheel; when the bones of every joint had been crushed with metal bars, let the flesh be beaten to a pulp with iron whips; let them die at last in thirst and mad raving. In England let him who would not put himself upon the jury be led away and laid upon the ground and great weights be put upon his breast, and let him at last die when he had been slowly crushed together by the *peine forte et dure*. John of Leyden, who defied the Bishop of Münster, was bound to a column, and every part of his body torn with glowing pincers, before a crown of gleaming iron from the fire was put upon him. Gerard, who struck down William the Silent, was beaten with metal rods and everywhere crushed with red-hot pincers. Damien suffered unspeakable torments before he was torn apart by horses in the square of Paris. Two centuries ago punishment for high treason was a ghastly sight in England. In 1680, in the chamber of Peers, the High Steward spoke to the aged Lord Strafford: "The Judgment of the Law is . . . That you go to the Place whence you came; from thence you must be drawn upon a Hurdle to the Place of Execution. When you come there, you must be hanged up by the Neck, but not till you are dead; for you must be cut down alive: Your Privy Members must be cut off; and your Bowels ript up, before your Face; and thrown into the Fire: then your Head must be severed from your Body, and your Body divided into Four Quarters; and these must be at the Disposal of the King. And God Almighty be merciful to your Soul."

I

In the development of judicial procedure torture became an important instrument of legal inquisition. In early times, when there was much crime and little means of repressing it, when the science of evidence was ill understood, and when lying and knavery flourished, when simple judges desired complete proof and had difficulty in obtaining any, that which was most desired in the case of a person guilty or suspect was confession, *vox vera*, the proof of all others the best. Of old, to obtain this, torture was used in Egypt, in Carthage, and Assyria. It was well known in Hellenic lands, where many a slave was taken, and where sometimes a free citizen was thus put to death. It was approved by Demosthenes and Aristotle, and made the subject of jest by the master of comic writing. In Rome the law of torture, developing from the time of the Twelve Tables, expanded with the majesty of Roman law until it found place in digest and code. Condemned by the enlightened Cicero and also by Seneca, and praised faintly by Ulpian, it was yet used upon numberless slaves and later upon freemen and Christians. "Burn Lygdamus! The slave! Heat the metal plates white hot!"—in one of the finest of the poems of Propertius. As Rome passed away, she left her heritage to the church, which, borrowing so much else, took also the "question" as a thing that was lawful; and the sombre and fearful tales of the Inquisition, and the awful stories in numberless forgotten books and pamphlets remain to show how much of the spirit of Nero and Diocletian was carried to the age of the Reformation and the Wars of Religion.

In Italy, in Spain, in France, in Russia, in Scotland, in Germanic and Scandinavian countries, torture was used through long ages, until at last it was diminished by the humanitarianism of the eighteenth century and ended by the spirit of the French Revolution. It is true that there was for a while much diminution as compared with the time when edicts went forth from Rome or Milan, or when procedure was directed from Constantinople. In the barbarian codes there is less of it than in the Roman law beside which they grew; and in the kingdoms founded upon the ruins of Rome proof was sought partly in such devices as compurgation, ordeal, and trial by combat, in which heaven was implored to decide, and which, silly and absurd as now they seem, had less of cruelty than proceeding with torture. It is also true that in mediæval and early modern times one kingdom was an honorable exception in the use of torture to obtain confession. In England peculiarity in the spirit of legal development brought it about that torture was never sanctioned by the common law, something of which Fortescue and Coke both boast. But it must be said that even here torture was employed by those councils and courts which rose under the king's prerogative outside the common law, and that a multitude of men and women were crushed or racked asunder, especially under the Tudors and Stuarts.

Ghastly stories torment the fancy of those who have read them in the records or tales of the past. The foot of Esmeralda was crushed just a little, and she accused herself falsely. And from the pages of another novelist of France still ring through the chambers of the mind the shrieks of those who in the darkness of their dungeons lay

*Especial interest attaches to Mr. Turner's scholarly article at this time because of the convention called to assemble in New York City on May 5, for taking concerted action against lynching.—Editor of the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with legs so crushed that the bones within them were crushed. When Anne Askew was taken from the rack her joints were so torn that she had to be borne to the stake. The frontispiece of an old book about the persecution of the Covenanters shows the boots and the thumbkins in crude drawings whose crudity reveals but too well the fearful and haggard expression of the sufferers. In Spain, terror of things whispered about the doings of the Holy Office was such that the sight of Padre Isla's impostors disguised as Inquisitors was enough to render Samuel Simon helpless. In the galleries of the old world there are rooms accursed with the presence of pictures by those whose fancy was anguished with these things; and they affrighted the strange, sad intellect of the greatest of American writers. Some may have opened the dusty, crackling pages of a pamphlet in the British Museum in which an unknown writer tells to Englishmen a story of the Inquisition: how the victim was stretched upon the rack until pain ruled all of his body, and the slightest movement sent exquisite agony throbbing through every joint; how a thick and wetted cloth was thrust down his throat so that air was scarcely drawn through; how at last the cloth was thick with the blood of the sufferer's throat, and every breath was got with convulsive effort much like the struggle of death.

II

There is something worse than all this. Fearsome things irk the mind with dreariness and horror as thought goes back by devious ways to black and awful happenings of the past, through tradition and memorial leading beyond the horizon of world's history, or even through half-forgotten, half-remembered reminiscences of childhood or vanished racial past. Torture and death with pain have not been employed only to deter the vicious from evil or force a confession, or by religious bigots with hearts turned to stone. Far more fearful, they have been the sport of those who delighted in suffering of others. In some fearful way this has seemed to characterize debased childhood of peoples and individuals —the primitive years of mankind. At times there are younger folk who take delight in crushing bugs, in crippling animals, or even in giving to other people pain. Missionaries and explorers have found this spirit among savage peoples in every quarter of the earth. They have come across it in southeast Asia and in the lost parts of the tropics. Few of those who first came to America did not chance upon it, and nothing has done more to cast about the red Indians an evil renown. That great collection of the "Jesuit Relations" stands upon the shelves of libraries enshrouded with grewsome dread, for the volumes contain so many things which people might wish not to think about.

Refugees gave an appalling account of the martyrdom of Fathers Brébeuf and L'Alemant. Their hands were cut off or pierced with sharp awls or iron points; under their armpits and under their loins were put red-hot hatchets, while a necklace of heated hatchets was hung about the neck, so that in no posture could the sufferers escape torment, and round them were placed belts of bark filled with pitch and resin which, set afire, roasted all of the body. Pieces of the thighs and of the legs were cut away and broiled and eaten, while red-hot irons were inserted in the wounds. Of Father Brébeuf the scalp and the lips were torn off and the nose cut away. Into the eyes of Father L'Alemant burning coals were set. The one escaped from his misery after a while; the other suffered sixteen hours.

According to narrators of these old accounts, the greatest pleasure of the savages was to listen to the shrieks of their victims, and they desired to prolong to the utmost the tortures inflicted, which commonly lasted throughout an entire night. On one occasion, when a large number of captives had been taken, they were distributed through the neighboring villages, so that all might share in the sport. A young Algonquin was taken by the Iroquois: "they put him to martyrdom for three days and three nights." Some could scarce wait until the principal spectacle was ready. A prisoner was bidden to put his hands upon the ground. One of the captors then pierced his hands with a heated iron and did not cease raising and lowering and sliding them along the iron until its glow had quenched.

A captain of the Iroquois was fastened to a stake upon a platform and tormented according to the pleasure of every one with flames, firebrands, and glowing irons, "in ways cruel beyond all power of description." His scalp was stripped from his head. Tearing himself free, he seized in the shreds of his hands a firebrand and long defended himself from his yelling assailants who ceased not to shower upon him firebrands and coals, while the blood streamed from his head over all of his body. At length a false step, and he fell from the scaffold; so his enemies cast his body into a fire. Again he rose bristling with cinders, but with burning brands clutched in the remnants of his hands, and threatening his enemies so that they durst not touch him, tottered forward to burn down their village. But they tripped him up and cut off his hands and feet and burned his body in many fires and thrust it under a blazing tree-trunk overturned, so that all his body was roasted. By one last effort he got free again and struggled towards his foes on elbows and knees.—All this starts forth from the old page like a baleful gleam of hell seen long ago in some black nightmare of the past.

III

Something of this spirit came down through the ages of mankind. Caligula, Gaius Cæsar, Ezzelino, Ivan the Terrible had much delight in cruelty and torture. Shortly after the Norman Conquest there dwelt in England a certain Robert of Belesme, who had come in with the Conqueror and long continued to trouble subjects and king. Ordericus Vitalis writes of him: "He thought little of mutilating men by putting out their eyes or cutting off their hands or feet, but took keenest joy in deep meditation of unheard-of punishments in the torture of unhappy wretches, in the manner of Phalaris the Sicilian. Those whom he kept in prison for some fault he tormented unspeakably, more savage than Nero, or Decius, or Diocletian, whereat he made cachinnation and merry joke with his parasites. He boasted of his pleasure at the tortures which he inflicted upon his prisoners; cruel, he rejoiced in the blame of men because of the excess of his punishments and preferred to give torments rather than by redemption of captives to gain increase of his treasure."

If it be true, this is one of the things which has cast deepest stain upon the memory of James II of England. Before he came to the throne, when he was powerful in Scotland, it was the custom there that when any one was to be struck in the boots, it should be done in the presence of the council; the sight was so dreadful that most of the lords withdrew, if they could; but the Duke looked on with indifference, or rather with attention, as at some curious

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experiment; which, says Burnet, gave men terrible ideas about him.

As people became better, there were fewer who would have tortured for pleasure, but many were indifferent to pain inflicted, particularly if inflicted upon an inferior, and others were curious to see what they would themselves not have done. "Come," says Xanthias in one of Aristophanes's plays, "I'll do a very noble thing for you; take and torture this slave of mine." To prove his own innocence, he carelessly bids them hang the slave up, scourge him, put him to the rack, or pour vinegar into his nostrils. A wondrous throng flocked out to see the burning entrails and reeking quarters of the Regicides after Charles II returned. The gentle Evelyn saw not the execution, but he watched the mangled parts borne past in baskets on the hurdle. Some years before, the same author tells us that he went to the Châtelet in Paris, where a malefactor was to be put to the question. The prisoner was stretched by ropes and a wooden horse so that his joints were severed in miserable sort. Then confessing nothing, two buckets of water were poured down his throat, which swelled him in a manner frightful to see. There was another to be dealt with, but Evelyn went away. "Have you ever seen one put to the torture?" asks a character of Racine. "It is always a pastime for an hour or two."

IV

The American people developed under circumstances particularly happy. There was freedom and opportunity and escape from the heavy inheritance that the old world struggled with so long. Power of priest, ancient custom and feudal law, rank and caste, scarcely existed from the start. Men fondly imagined at first that in America Utopia might be such a one as its author had dreamed of. There was not to be torture, and only one instance of it is known now in the history of our court procedure; where Giles Cory was pressed with the weight at Salem. When a great nation was formed, the Constitution of the Union and most of the Constitutions of the States forbade cruel and unusual punishments. There was, then, no question in the prison chambers, no horror at the quartering-block or the stake. So we have tried to believe. Well, let us see.

Into this happy land, among the other races who came, there was brought a black people to be held as slaves, and thereafter as inferiors or outcasts. They were forced to labor, they were sometimes hard to manage, they were savage, they were uncouth, they were black, they were different. In earliest times sinister things took place, which boded ill for the future. There was much terror on the lonely plantations of the South, and some negroes accused of atrocious crimes were burned then. Hector St. John Crèvecœur relates an awful and melancholy tale of the negro whom he saw in a solitary place fastened up in a tree, blinded and almost eaten alive by the insects and birds of the air. In 1831 the wife of Nat Turner was tortured for evidence, and several slaves were burned with hot irons. In one of his early speeches Lincoln alludes to the mulatto in St. Louis who was suspended by a chain from a tree and slowly roasted alive. An author who has examined *Niles's Register* and the *Liberator* has collected not a few instances of negroes burned to death in the period before the Civil War. The violence of reconstruction brought much terror and many illegal punishments, but little, if any, of torture. As the years went on, however, there was increase in the lynching of negroes and also in the inflicting of pain. During the period 1882–1903 more than 3,000 people were lynched in the United States, of whom 2,500 were put to death in the South. Of the total number, 2,000 were negroes, nearly all in the South. Generally the method was hanging or shooting, but the writer who compiled these statistics noticed a considerable number of instances where the culprits were burned at the stake and expressed the belief that as lynching continued the severity of the punishments increased, and that the victims were tortured more and more before death came to relieve them.

It is not easy to get authentic information about the torturing of persons lynched in the United States, because of the distant places where the deeds are done, because of local sentiment, and because of the illegal circumstances attending the deed. It is certain that a considerable number of black people have been burned at the stake. A man and a woman were burned to death in Mississippi in 1904. After the commission of a very evil crime, it is said that several negroes were gashed in every part of their bodies with knives, flayed, and roasted alive slowly over a platform of green and smoking wood. In Pennsylvania a negro criminal already wounded was brought forth from his confinement, chained to the bed in which he was carried, and burned in the street, to the great delight of the mob, who thrust him back into the fire whenever he struggled to rise. On one occasion, when pursuers were unable to capture a fugitive, they tortured instead the black woman who was his wife. Some months ago there was a horrible occurrence in Tennessee, and almost yesterday an equally dreadful one. As a rule, the story of these things is hushed up. If the disgrace is felt at all, it is stifled, and the infamy is soon forgotten. Occasionally this is not possible, and then the event may be taken, not because it is much worse than others, but because it is better known, to point a moral and bring repentance and atonement to our civilization.

V

In the commonwealth of Texas there is a city called Waco. It has 30,000 inhabitants and is a prosperous place, well dowered with schools and colleges, with public buildings and hotels and banks. Near by, the wife of a small farmer was criminally assaulted and murdered. Suspicion pointed, justly it would seem, to a sullen, ignorant negro youth, who may have been mentally defective. Indignation was great, and there was danger of immediate lynching, but some pledged themselves to let the law take its course if the criminal waived his legal rights and the authorities acted with promptness. The trial was held at once, verdict of guilty was returned, he was to be hanged immediately. But a great mob had thronged round the court house and pressed into the place of trial. It is said that low politics and low-class public officials abetted the spirit of vengeance. It was easy to get the prisoner. He was seized and hurried away.

There is confused account of what followed, since there are so many accounts, but the important facts are reported as beyond doubt. The negro was dragged down the stairs. Shrieking and struggling, his clothing was ripped apart, his ear slashed off, and the organs of sex cut away. A chain was fastened about the body, which was dragged behind an automobile to the place of execution. On the way, every one who could struck at him with knives, clubs, and missiles, until the body was red all over with the wounds. Thus

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at last he came to a square which is behind the City Hall. Nor far away, under the Mayor's window, at which that official is said to have been standing, there is a tree which should be cut down, lest its memory curse those who see it in the future. There were great masses of people all about, there were women and children, there were little children. There was a small boy up in the branches of the death tree, where he stayed until the fire caused him to come down. At the base of this tree quantities of inflammable material were gathered. Around the neck of the negro not yet dead was placed a chain, which was then carried over one of the branches above and passed to the crowd beyond. Then he was jerked aloft and lowered into the waiting pyre. As the smoke began to rise, applause went up which was heard far away, for there were many thousands of people who shouted—in the square, on the sward by the City Hall, from the windows, from the tops of buildings, and from trees. The body was burned to a crisp and left until the fire had smouldered down. Afterward the charred torso was dragged with a rope by a horseman through the streets of the city. As this was done, the limbs dropped off, children played with the head, and the relics were taken by those who could get them. Such is the tale. The story of a lowly and despised criminal, for whom there may not be much pity, nor any of the nobility and pathos which has enshrined the martyrs of Fox. It is the story of something sordid and base and vile, but it is also the story of a community casting its soul away.

VI

Cruelty is one of the most dreadful things, and love of it most terrible of all. One is at a loss even to explain it. That it is associated with the primitive or diseased and wicked there seems no doubt. Why do savages delight in torturing, or some children in the tearing of wings from off beetles? Is it mere primitive love of destruction, out of which civilization struggled through such arduous length of time? Why do tyrants sometimes love to flay and rack and twist? Why did the Inquisitors divert themselves with the invention of new torments? From love of power, it may be, or through mental derangement or sexual perversion. Some have thought from interaction of anger and fear. One may not know, perhaps, for there are dark recesses of the mind not yet explored. And so one may not know exactly why men in Pennsylvania or Texas or Tennessee have done these things. It would be possible to find excuse—the spirit of excitement and the mob; extreme wrath; the desire to strike terror; race hatred and bitter wrong. But may it not also be largely desire to have pleasure in seeing pain? Whatever it is, we have seen much of it in Belgium and Servia and Armenia, and nothing can explain it away, as nothing can remove the shame and disgrace of it. It would seem to result from hideous primitive instinct once common to men, and still with some people, it may be with all of us, only partly gone.

Woe to those who permit it in their midst! Not only shall their fair name be gone, but they themselves are in danger; they must expect to see this hideous thing, lurking darkly in society, plague them in the administration of their prisons and asylums, show itself in the ordinary life of the base and uncouth whenever they get power, and sometimes, when the madness of men becomes the lust and unreason of the mob, burst forth with all the frightfulness it had long ago in ages of the past.

The Blackbird in Early Literature

By GRACE HARRIET MACURDY

IN Shakespeare's "Midsummer Night's Dream" there is a reference to

The Ousel-cock so black of hue
With orange-tawny bill.

"The adult male of this beautiful and well-known bird," says an English ornithologist, "scarcely needs any other description than that of the poet." And it sets one to musing on that ever fascinating and vexed question, "What is poetry?" when we note that Aristotle, in the baldest of Greek prose, gives the first picture of the *turdus merula* in European literature in much the same terms. "The he-blackbird," he says, "is black all over, with a bill of Phœnician-red." And Dionysius, adapting Aristotle, says: "There be two kinds of blackbirds, one black all over, the other with a bill like unto beeswax, and these latter birds be the best singers."

In every European country the *turdus merula* is found, and the wise in philology tell us that the Latin *merula*, the Old High German *amsala*, and the English *ousel* or *woozel* or *ouzel* are all kin. So that makes *merle* and *ousel* doublets in a way, unlike as they are in sound. The word "blackbird" first occurs in English in Dame Juliana Berners's "Boke of Saint Albans," published in 1486, in the chapter on hunting—"the blackbride and the thrush." Cotgrave, in his French-English Dictionary of 1660, gives as a definition of the French *merle* the three names, "a mearle, owsell, blackbird." It is not, of course, our own beautiful blackbird with the dash of crimson in its plumage. The ousel does not come to us. It ventures to the Atlantic islands and to Barbary, and even to the Arctic regions, but does not desire our citizenship.

Strangely enough, the blackbird is hardly mentioned in Greek literature before the Hellenistic period. Aristophanes, with all his bird lore (he names seventy-eight varieties in the "Birds"), has only a passing jest about a blackbird, to which he does not give the usual Greek name. The nightingale and the cicada, "the wayside nightingale," have been known and loved from the earliest times. Homer speaks of both, and the poets after him never weary of praising them. Hesiod's delightful lines about the dark-winged, shrilling cicada, sitting on its green bough and singing of summer, feeding on dewdrops, its song never ceasing from dawn to dark in the long summer day, found many echoes down to Saint Gregory Nazianzen. "Who placed the lyre in the breast of the cicada and taught it all those songs and chirrupings on the boughs, when, stirred by the sun, they sing their midday melody, and make the groves vocal, and cheer the passing traveller on his way?" (Rogers's translation). And every one knows Sappho's lovely and untranslatable line about the nightingale,—

ἦρος ἄγγελος ἰμερόφωνος ἀηδών.

But no poet speaks of the blackbird's song before Theocritus. I will here attempt a translation of one of his loveliest epigrams, a little poem that is instinct with the spirit of the pastoral:

At the oak-coppice, goatherd, leave the lane
And you shall come upon an image rude,

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Made from a fig-branch for the woodland fane
And newly fashioned; still upon the wood
The bark clings to the three-forked, earless thing;
Only the symbol of fertility
Shows that the shrine is meet for worshipping
The Cyprian goddess, foam-born from the sea.

There is a holy hedge, and silver streams
Down dropping from the rock unceasing fall,
Through bay and myrtle sweet the water gleams
And clustered grapevines climb the cypress tall.
There the shrill blackbird makes the spring rejoice
With many a liquid quavering note and trill
While the brown nightingale's melodious voice
Sends answering sweetness from her tiny bill.

Slay there a kid and to Priapus pray
That he in kindness free me from this pain,
Bidding my love for Daphnis flee away,
And I in thankfulness to him again
A threefold offering to his shrine will bring,
A shaggy he-goat and a heifer rare,
And from the fold a lamb, a soft white thing,
If but in mercy he will hear my prayer.

The blackbird appears next in the Anthology in an amatory epigram of Rhianos, a Cretan poet of the first century before Christ, to whose poems Meleager refers in the Garland as the "marjoram of sweetbreathing Rhianos." By this time the blackbird has acquired the epithet "holy," which clings to it later. The magical beauty of Theocritus has vanished, and it is a far cry from his delightful lines in the third idyll—

Would that I might be the humming bee and enter thy cave,
Flying through the ivy and the fern,

to the prayer of Rhianos to be an imprisoned thrush or blackbird. This is the theme of Rhianos:

Under the bough of a planetree Dexionikos with birdlime
Made a blackbird his prey, seizing the fluttering wing.
Loud lamented the holy merle, so keen was his anguish.
Would O Cupid and ye, goddesses breathing with love,
Fate might grant that I a missel-thrush be, or a blackbird,
So in that lovely hand I too might weep and lament.

Another poet who is honored in Meleager's Garland of poets, Antipater of Sidon (Meleager speaks of "the young Phœnician cypress of Antipater"), also calls the blackbird holy in a poem which was destined to a "damnable iteration" in the following centuries. The theme becomes a regular *cliché*. I give my translation here:

A fat thrush and a singing merle were caught
In twofold net of horsehair; ne'er again
To meet the early dawn the thrush fared forth,
There in the plaited net it found its bane.
The other net sent forth the blackbird free,
The holy merle flew up on joyous wing.
The lesson, friend, is plain for all to see,—
Even the deaf bird-net spareth those that sing.

This is repeated by Archias (of the first century A. D. if it be Archias of Antioch, and of date unknown if it be Archias of Mitylene). His poem runs thus:

Fieldfares once and a blackbird over a hedge were driven
Into a net fine-meshed, thin as a cloud of the sky.
Them did the snare hold fast, the fieldfares, prisoned within it;
Sent forth the blackbird free, free from the twists of the cord.
Truly the race of singers is holy, for even a bird-snare
Spareth the minstrel's life, giveth the songster release.

And Paulus Silentiarius, Gentleman of the Bedchamber at the Byzantine court in the reign of Justinian, the most distinguished poet of his time, does not hesitate to embellish the theme as follows:

Once in the early dawn a sweet-voiced merle and a fieldfare
Fell in a cloudlike net, plaited of many a thread.
Prison the fieldfare found in the net that knows no escaping;
Swift was the flight of the merle, home to her forest belov'd.
Artemis, surely, the huntress, the blessed, set free the songster,
Freed for Apollo's sake, lord of the song and the lyre.

An unknown author, in a poem to the cicada, which I translate as follows, mentions the blackbird not for its melody, but for its thieving:

Why, O shepherds, do you tear me,
Poor cicada-nightingale,
From the branches dew-besprinkled,
Where I tell to all my tale?

In the hills and shady copses
You may hear me as you pass,
Hear the wayside hermit-lover,
When the dew is on the grass.

See the fieldfare, see the blackbird!
Licensed pilferers are they.
See that starling, rural robber!
Him it were no sin to slay.

But why grudge ye me my supper?
All my meal is leaf and dew;
Thrush and merle and wicked starling,
They your harvest's loss should rue.

This poem has its charm, but the loveliness of Theocritus has no rival in these later epigrams. Only one poem about the blackbird, by a poet of the first century A.D. or perhaps even later, Marcus Argentarius, shows a pastoral grace:

O blackbird, on the oak no longer stay,
Warbling so sweet upon the topmost bough,
This tree is not thy friend, fly far away,
The grapevine arbor doth invite thee now.
Amid its thick green shade now rest thy wing;
The oak bears mistletoe, a foe to thee.
Here mayst thou feed upon the grape and sing
To Bacchus, him who loves all minstrelsy.

The blackbird comes thus late into Greek poetry. Aristophanes leaves nothing undone to express the flute-like sweetness of the exquisite voice that comes from the nightingale's tiny throat, and he writes beautiful lines about the sun-mad cicada and its note poured forth in the noonday heat; but he does not notice the melody of the blackbird.

Roman literature does not recognize the sweetness of the blackbird's note. When Horace calls the blackbird and the wood-dove *suaves res*, he is praising them as part of a menu. Plautus refers once to the blackbird as singing "cum cibo, cum quiqui"—evidently a colloquial imitation of the song. It is not until post-Roman times—"exeunte antiquitate"—that a poet writing in Latin in Germany or France gives the blackbird credit for melodious song—

Et merulus modulans tam pulchris zinzitat odis.

After the fourth epigram of Theocritus I know of nothing that has been written of the blackbird's song so lovely as these lines from a sonnet by John Masefield:

Go spend your penny, Beauty, where you will,
In the grave's darkness let the stamp be lost.
The water still will bubble from the hill,
And April quicken the meadows with her ghost;
Over the grass the daffodils will shiver,
The primroses with their pale beauty abound,
The blackbird be a lover and make quiver
With his glad singing the great soul of the ground.

"For," says Theocritus at the beginning of his thirteenth idyll, "not to us first does Beauty show herself as Beauty, to us who are creatures of a day and behold not the morrow."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New United States

IX. The Blight of Intolerance

WHEN, a few years ago, the American Association of University Professors was formed, there seemed good reason for hoping that the gross infringements upon what had come to be called academic freedom, the glaring inequalities in professional pay and status, and the more subtle discriminations and injustices which had long disgraced American colleges and universities, the obvious result of which could only be to destroy the attractiveness of teaching as a career, were at last to be effectively checked. The painstaking and judicial reports which the Association, relying upon publicity as a remedy, made public from time to time were certainly not without some chastening effect upon presidents and governing boards, and undoubtedly contributed in a number of instances to the improvement of the relations between professors and the institutions which employed them. When, however, it became apparent, as it did very soon, that the Association had neither the will nor the power to compel redress for its members who had suffered, and that well-indorsed candidates could still be found for professorships whose incumbents had been unjustly discharged, university administrators speedily took the measure of the Association and rightly judged that it was no longer to be feared. The Association still investigates and reports, but it has not curbed the tyranny of university rulers, nor has it aroused the professoriate to effective action for its own defence.

The most striking recent illustration of the persistence of administrative autocracy and injustice is afforded by the case of Professor Louis Levine, a member of the department of economics in the University of Montana. On February 7 Chancellor Edward C. Elliott, in a telegram addressed to President E. O. Sisson, head of the academic department of the University at Missoula, announced that he had on that date, "under the rules of the State Board of Education," suspended Professor Levine "from further duty as a member of the faculty of the State University, for insubordination and for unprofessional conduct prejudicial to the welfare of the university." The authority for this action of the Chancellor, who is appointed by the Board and acts as its executive officer, is found in a document known as "Administrative Memorandum No. 100," issued from the Chancellor's office at Helena on June 29, 1918, and embodying "regulations governing appointment, promotion, and compensation, and tenure of instructional and scientific staffs," adopted by the Board on June 22. The second paragraph of Section 7 of the portion of the Memorandum which deals with tenure provides that "in cases of gross inefficiency, reprehensible conduct, or insubordination, the Chancellor may suspend any administrative officer or member of the instructional or scientific staffs until the next regular meeting of the Board. In such cases the payment of salary shall cease at the time of suspension. If the charges made are not sustained by the Board, salary shall be paid for the period of suspension."

The order of suspension followed close upon the publication by Professor Levine of a monograph on "The Taxation of Mines in Montana." The monograph, the preparation of which was begun early in 1918, was undertaken with the knowledge and approval of Chancellor Elliott, and with the understanding that it would be published by the University as a university bulletin. In order that Professor Levine might have time in which to write the monograph, his teaching schedule was reduced during the spring and summer quarters of 1918. Certain expenses incurred in the collection of data were paid by the University. An examination of the monograph shows it to be a careful, thorough, and scholarly piece of work and a valuable contribution to the subject of which it treats. When, however, in November, the first draft of the monograph was submitted to the Chancellor, he expressed the opinion that its publication by the University would probably be inadvisable, and suggested that copies be submitted to the Board of Education for its decision. The latter suggestion was presently withdrawn. In December, after further conference with the Chancellor, it was agreed that the monograph should be put to press, but should be held until Governor Stewart, as chairman of the Board, could pass upon the question of its publication as a university bulletin; and that in case such publication was declined, Professor Levine should have the right to publish the work at his own expense.

On January 9, in a letter to Professor Levine, the Chancellor stated at some length his reasons for thinking the publication of the monograph inadvisable.

> The question of mine taxation (he wrote) is one around which sharp political controversy has ever been waged in Montana. Two years ago the Legislative Assembly created a special commission to study and report upon the tax situation in the State. The results of the work of this commission are before the Legislative Assembly now in session. From every standpoint of sound public policy it is untimely and inappropriate for the university, as an agency of the State, through any of its representatives, to intrude itself into discussion of the tax problem. Any such intrusion is bound to be misunderstood by the public and by the members of the legislature.

The letter, pointing out certain parts of the monograph which, in the Chancellor's opinion, showed an "apparently prejudiced attitude" and "personal bias," concludes:

> Entirely apart, however, from the character and content of the monograph itself, I have a firm conviction that, notwithstanding the limitations which such a policy apparently places upon the greatest usefulness of the University, the development of the institution and the confidence reposed in it by the people of the State will be best conserved by avoiding all active participation in, and also all partisanship towards, those questions which sharply divide our people politically. Weighing all the existing circumstances, it seems best for the larger and permanent interest of the University that any publication of this bulletin be indefinitely postponed.

Professor Levine, while acquiescing in the rejection of the monograph as a university bulletin, was unable to concede a right in the Chancellor to forbid, by implication at least, its publication in other form; and he accordingly issued the work as a private matter. The publication was promptly followed, as has been stated, by Professor Levine's suspension on charges of insubordination and unprofessional conduct, with loss of salary, until the State Board of Education should next meet.

The conclusion seems irresistible that the only foundation for the charges was the fact that Professor Levine had published a book which the Chancellor had earnestly urged should be withheld. Back of that, however, was the fact that the book, although studiously moderate in tone, was

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not a pleasant one for the mining companies to read. The mining corporations as a whole, and the Anaconda Copper Mining Company in particular, have long been regarded as powerful influences in Montana politics. That the Anaconda Company had reason to be sensitive to criticism is apparent from the concluding paragraph of the chapter which Professor Levine devotes to that corporation.

> During the five years 1913-17, the average assessment of the Anaconda Copper Mining Company was 6.6 per cent. of the total assessment of the State, and the Company paid 6.7 per cent. of all taxes collected in the State. The Company was assessed at about 25 per cent. of the true value of all its properties in Montana, while agricultural land is reported to have been assessed at 35 per cent., livestock at 45, bank stock at 60. During the same period the Anaconda Copper Mining Company paid about the same number of mills on its assessment as all other property in the State; but the Anaconda Copper Mining Company paid only about 8 mills on the estimated true value of its Montana properties, while all other property paid on an average of 12 to 14 mills. And, finally, the Anaconda Copper Mining Company paid in taxes to the State about 6 per cent. of its income derived from operations in Montana, while other property, especially farming property, paid an average of 10 to 12 per cent. This, then, is the comparative tax burden in Montana in so far as it can be measured on the basis of available data.

Herein lies the crux of the matter so far as politics is concerned. It is unnecessary to assume that the Anaconda Company or any of its agents asked for Professor Levine's removal, or that Chancellor Elliott deliberately put the interests of the mining corporations ahead of the interests of the University; that, in either case, would have been a crude way of going about it. Nor is it important to urge that Professor Levine had ample warning that the publication of his book might get him into trouble, and that he went forward with his eyes open. It was his right as a citizen and a professor to publish his book if he chose to do so, and any assumption that he had waived that right by virtue of having accepted appointment as a professor, and that the Governor, or the Chancellor, or the State Board of Education was thenceforward the keeper of his soul, would be as immoral as it is unsound. If scholars and teachers may not expose injustice, to whom does that duty belong? If members of a State university may not take part in public discussion because public opinion is divided, for what purpose does the university exist?

Whatever excuse, however, is to be offered for the conduct of Chancellor Elliott on the ground of the political situation in the State, or because of the further fact that a few days after Professor Levine's case was made public, a legislative investigation of the alleged teaching of socialism in the educational institutions of the State was started, the case for the Chancellor falls to the ground when the provisions of Memorandum No. 100, and his action under it, are examined. Even conceding, as Chancellor Elliott and others have stated, that the Memorandum as a whole was intended to improve the organization of the University and to stabilize the tenure of professors and others, the provision regarding suspension is unmitigatedly vicious and the application of it in the Levine case was a glaring offence against elementary principles of right. Granting that the power to suspend a professor without notice for grave cause may properly be lodged somewhere, the stoppage of pay during the period of suspension is a flagrant injustice. Until the legislature of Montana, at its recent session, provided by law for quarterly meetings of the State Board of Education, the Board met regularly only twice a year, in December and June. Professor Levine, who was suspended early in February, accordingly faced a four-months' deprivation of salary unless the Board should choose to hold a special meeting. To add to the injustice, the specific grounds upon which the charges of insubordination and unprofessional conduct were based were not communicated to Professor Levine or to the president or faculty of the University at Missoula; nor were they laid before the faculty Committee on Service, created by the Memorandum itself for the express purpose of examining "fully" into "the circumstances or charges" involved in the suspension of any member of the University or any proposed termination of appointment, if the member in question requested it, and of submitting to the president of the institution and to the member involved a report of its findings. Professor Levine was arbitrarily suspended and his salary stopped, with no specification of the grounds upon which he was accused and consequently with no means of adequately preparing his defence, and with no assurance that the Board of Education, the only body which could pass upon his guilt or innocence, would meet in less than four months.

It is pleasant to record that, at a meeting of the State Board of Education held at Helena on April 7-8, Professor Levine was reinstated and his arrears of salary ordered paid. A careful reading of the record of the meeting, however, fails to show a clear settlement of any of the issues involved. If, so far as Professor Levine was concerned, the Board yielded to an aroused public opinion, the proceedings so far as Chancellor Elliott was concerned were only another example of "whitewash." The Board did not, it is true, support the Chancellor's contention that reinstatement should be made probationary, but it adopted, by a vote of six to three, a motion that the suspension of Professor Levine be approved, and rejected, by a vote of seven to two, a motion to take from the Chancellor the power of suspension and to vest it in the Board. Memorandum No. 100 has not been modified, and may be applied again to any member of any department of the University whenever the Chancellor chooses to use it, and in the same way as in Professor Levine's case.

The case of Professor Levine is typical of the jeopardy into which any professor in any college or university in the United States may at any moment fall. The intolerance of free thought and free speech which for the moment threatened to wreck his career is at one with that which, whether exercised by narrow-minded boards of regents or by heated public opinion which has silenced scores of professors and led other scores to forsake the universities altogether, which is expelling the German language from schools and discrediting the study of it in colleges in half the States, and which is rapidly bringing the public school teachers of New York and other large cities to the point of open revolt. Doubtless it is not of the nature of war to engender tolerance, but the blight which has fallen upon the American universities during these years when liberty and democracy have been placarded on every wall and preached from every platform, is one of the gravest signs of the times. Unless the professoriate can unite to end the autocracy and illiberality which now prevail, it can hope for only a meagre part in the new era of democratic freedom and intellectual liberty. Perhaps the action which the professors at the University of Illinois are reported to have taken points the way.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Havana

By WITTER BYNNER

I NEVER saw your face,
But I saw you every night
Lean in the self-same place
Against the waning light.

There on your roof of the town
You would come out, like me,
To watch the sun go down
Beyond the sea.

And into my towered place
I would climb up, like you.
I never saw your face—
I never needed to.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter did not notice him until the train reached Bleecker Street. He was a shabby man with a shabby family and he anxiously watched the stations, for he had been told to get out at Park Place. When Park Place was reached the chaos of babies and bundles was such that the Drifter stepped forth to aid the helpless creatures. Carrying a bundle and smiling a dumb smile at a small boy with a stick of candy, he brought them to the foot of Vesey Street, where their ship was awaiting them. There were still many formalities. The family was grateful and glad to talk. They were bound for the old country. Clearly the man was one of the "plain workers with plain habits" who must be saved for the country "to do plain work." The Drifter decided that the moment had come for some plain talk. He remembered a few lines from a pamphlet on Americanization. "Look here, my friend," he said, "aren't you making a mistake? You are going back to the homeland. You are going back to poverty and hardship and want. You leave a country of plenty and freedom and liberty and democratic institutions. Don't you think that you owe it to your children to stay?" He watched the effect of his words. At first there was no answer. Then a dull hatred narrowed the eyes of the man. Slowly he repeated the four mystic words, "Plenty, freedom, liberty, and democracy." He looked at his wife. Silently his right hand pointed at his children, pale and undersized and ragged. His left hand, after the habit of Eastern people, touched the Drifter's coat. "Mister," he said, "you seem to be a kind man. But you have never lived in a factory town. You probably mean well, but you do not know what you are talking about." Then he sat down on an old carpetbag and waited until the gates should open to allow the steerage passengers to go on board.

* * * * *

THE Drifter has for a long time felt the need of a hinterland. Not only does the possession of a hinterland argue respectability and prestige, but it offers such realms to the imagination. Dalmatia was the Drifter's first choice. A remembrance of those jagged peaks glowing in the sunset wakes all one's brigand fancies. The Middle Ages could be lured back into those fastnesses and held for ransom by the pen. Among those purpling rocky isles, tawny sails skim sapphire bays, and tempt piracy once more to levy its share of the freedom of the seas.

* * * * *

BUT Dalmatia is evidently removed from the hinterland class, and the mountain-loving Drifter turns with almost equal enthusiasm to the Ten Thousand Peaks of Korea. What a refuge for one's dreams in those wide-roofed Buddhist monasteries overhanging mountain streams of foaming amber! With one's fancy a-perch on one of those pinnacles (which can be scaled by nothing more ponderous) one might gaze over giant forests and solitary waterfalls back into the early centuries—were it not for the native Christians. Yet why allow one's visions to be jarred by enthusiastic converts—are not they, too, part of a well-chosen hinterland? Could the Drifter afford to lose that progressive native preacher who celebrated his increase of salary by adding another wife to his establishment, or that more thrifty colleague who sold his wife to buy a phonograph—which could be "turned off" at will?

* * * * *

BUT Korea, too, is emerging from the background, and the Drifter must look further. There is, perhaps, less competition for Mongolia. Attention is focussed on the game in the middle distance of China, where shadows of gigantic proportion move to and fro across the checkered spheres of influence, setting their pawns in concession after concession. Meanwhile, the Drifter watches the Chinese settlers sidling up on the vast green plateau, carrying their bird cages and phonographs and silently pushing toward the desert the red-cloaked Mongols with their tents of felt, their flocks, and their swift wild horses.

* * * * *

CLEARLY the Drifter must forego romance and find a more practical hinterland. A mandatory will not do—the eyes of the world keep too careful watch, and the manner of grand seigneur may never be relaxed. Spheres of influence are old-fashioned and overworked. Acquisitions and annexations are sharply contested, and are ill to house—they clamor for their share. But picture the convenience of an inconspicuous, sound-proof hinterland where the fruits of the earth lie at hand, where ragged waifs of selfishness, intolerance, and greed—barred from our well-kept gardens—may riot unashamed and unreproved! Where nations show the way, citizens delight to follow—the Drifter must have his hinterland, if it be only a back yard.

THE DRIFTER

Contributors to this Issue

EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER is professor of European History at the University of Michigan.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY is professor of Greek and Head of the Greek Department in Vassar College.

LEWIS GANNETT is an American correspondent in Paris.

KENNETH DURANT was in Rome for the Committee on Public Information.

W. P. CROZIER is an editorial writer on the *Manchester Guardian*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

What the Czar Would Have Done to Mr. Debs

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I believe it will be of interest to your readers to know the penalty to which Eugene V. Debs would have been liable under the Russian Penal Code of 1903, which was enacted prior to the first revolution and remained in force up to the present revolution. Pursuant to Section 129, Subdivision 3, of that code, a person found "guilty of delivering or reading in public an address or composition, or of circulating and exposing publicly a composition or image inciting . . . to disobedience of or resistance to the law . . . shall be punished . . . by imprisonment in a house of correction for a term not exceeding three years."

A RUSSIAN LAWYER

New York, April 26

Inherited Punishment

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Ten or twenty years of imprisonment, meted out to certain radical leaders in this country may not prevent the ever-growing unrest and teach loyalty to American institutions. How then is posterity to be cured of the evils of radicalism? Why not visit the sins of fathers or mothers or sons upon the remaining members of the family? Recently convicted radicals may never live to finish their twenty-year sentences. Will the Government be appeased? Will the lesson be taught? Certainly not. But suppose, with the death of the prisoner, his punishment should be extended to the wife, the father, or the son, or failing these, on some other family of the same name, until the sentence were complete—what a triumph for the Law!

This is, of course, a mere outline. I am confident that the august body of judges and various other upholders of our sacrosanct institutions, will work out the details with amazing ingenuity. The plan is gratis. WILLIAM OLEON

Pittsburgh, April 10

Can We Be Out-Voted?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Associated Press dispatches of March 18 credit—or, perhaps, charge—Mr. McAdoo with the following language in a speech at Albuquerque, New Mexico: "Those who are spreading anti-league propaganda forget to tell their audiences that the Constitution of the League as it now stands requires the unanimous vote of its members on all questions except a few of technical procedure. So, I ask you, how could we be outvoted?" This is a great relief. If there is to be no decision adverse to us we certainly cannot be injured. We can all combine in compelling non-member nations to be good, for on this theory the League will have no other function than to settle disputes with or between non-member nations, a function which would of course expire when the last outsider is admitted.

There is only one disturbing thought to mar our satisfaction—the requirement of unanimity does not seem to be thoroughly established by the document in question. If we could only be sure that Mr. McAdoo's interpretation would be accepted by Brazil, China, Czecho-Slovakia, and each of the other nations whose single votes must unite with the single vote of the United States to reach the necessary unanimous conclusion as to what the rules mean! Possibly Mr. Venizelos, whom President Wilson has characterized as the greatest man at the peace table, might suggest that a nation which cannot vote at all cannot be out-voted.

The mind developed in a democracy can readily reconcile itself to being out-voted; but Mr. McAdoo has raised the question of whether that can be done in the new world democracy. Why leave the matter in doubt? In the most important step in the history of the nation, why not be sure of the ground on which our foot is to fall? WILLIAM N. VAILE

Washington, D. C., April 16

The Cruel Art of Making Enemies

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Years ago I learned Hungarian in order to understand the works of the great mathematician Bolyai Farkas, whose native place is now in the hands of the Rumanian invader, who justified by his rapacity the Turkish proverb *küchük gushun aghzy böyük dir* (the mouth of the small bird is big). It was a great joy to me when on January 19 I received directly from Hungary a presentation copy of the eighth volume of the Magyar Shakespeare Yearbook. This token of friendship was particularly welcome because it was evident proof of the Hungarians' intention to reëstablish their friendly relations with this country. Unfortunately the great of this earth have willed it otherwise! Says the Turk: *ben yeyemedim, bary sen ye* (I have not eaten, but you eat!). Say the great of this earth: I shall eat my fill, but you shall not have any food.

"All nations have their message from on high,
Each the Messiah of some central thought,
For the fulfilment and delight of man."

JOSEPH DE PEROTT

Worcester, Mass., April 6

Elizabethan, Not Middle-Western

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The Middle West has enough sins to answer for without having a slur cast upon it for using a word frequently found in the works of English writers of high standing, and the word "booze" was in common use several hundred years before Kansas was ever thought of. (See "Kansas in Reaction," in the *Nation* of March 15.) Booze or bouse, (Md. *busen*, German *bausen*, Dutch *buysen*) meaning liquor, strong drink, is found in the earliest English writers. Bouse is the earlier form, and all the standard dictionaries give them as interchangeable. But at least from the time of Elizabeth the word has been in common use, and the writers using it can hardly be called inelegant.

Spenser, in the "Faerie Queen" says:

"As he rode, he somewhat still did eat,
And in hand did bear a *bousing* can,
Of which he sipt."

Massinger and Dryden make free use of the word. The former in "A New Way to Pay Old Debts," says: "No *bouse?* nor no tobacco?" Nor could we fairly call Landor, Richard Harris Barham, Sheridan, or Douglas Jerrold inelegant. In the "Ingoldsby Legends" we find:

"He was a wild and roving lad,
Forever in the alehouse *boozing.*"

In "The School for Scandal": "While good Sir Peter *boozes* with the squire." In Mrs. Caudle's Curtain Lectures, Lecture II., she says to her suffering spouse: "Men can't answer for themselves, when they get *boozing* with one another."

To make up for this criticism of your paper, I wish to say that I enjoy the *Nation* more than anything which I read, not only on account of its courageous fight against intolerance and oppression in every form, but on account of the light it throws upon the situation in Europe, which I do not get from any other source. C.

Hingham, Mont., April 22

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Word for the Jugoslavs

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: The Jugoslav soldiers recruited from America for service with the Serbian army include Dalmatians, Slovaks and Croats. In all parts of Macedonia, and in Albania and Serbia I talked with these soldiers, who all speak English. When the United States went into the war it became apparent that their lot would have been a better one as American soldiers than as members of the poorly-equipped Serbian army. The scanty garments and meagre rations, to which the Serbian soldier had through long training become adapted, were insufficient for these men who had been accustomed to a high standard of physical well-being.

Many of them are now being discharged for physical reasons. In addition to their poverty, illness, and crippled condition, they bear also the burden of a great longing to return to America. But no arrangements exist whereby they may secure passage. Many soldiers have lost or had taken from them the papers proving their American citizenship. Those who had not received their papers are now obsessed by a fear that immigration regulations may deny them the privilege of return. Thus in most cases these men will probably return to civilian life, without money, in lands far from the one they call home.

Yesterday a poor wrecked fellow who had known prosperous days as a cook in Chicago came to me for advice. On his *Ordre de Depart* was the statement: "Il a le droit d'utiliser le chemin de fer de Salonique à Chicago en Amerique." Apparently in perfect seriousness, a Colonel of the Serbian army had signed this order for rail transportation across the trackless seas.

Salonica, Greece, February 11 Harry W. Frantz

Exclusive Fame

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: In the *Nation* of March 22 the interesting mention of the wonderful results of the Conservatoire de Musique of Paris reminded me of a little episode which gave the Conservatoire a different sort of fame. When Cherubini was director of the Conservatoire a young Hungarian applied for permission to enroll as a pupil. He was refused admittance, and the poor fellow became his own teacher. He did well, not only as pianist, but as interpreter, conductor, composer, and teacher; he also learned to understand Beethoven. His name was Franz Liszt.

Chicago, April 4 Th. Otterstrom

A New Departure

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: There is much to be said for the suggestion made by Mr. Frank Tannenbaum in the *Nation*, that the democratic method be applied to the process of teaching undergraduates—and, for that matter, to that of teaching graduates and experienced teachers.

Since the climate of Tucson makes the conventional campus summer-session impractical, a variation that promises to be an improvement has been planned. The University of Arizona plans to send into the field parties of students under the leadership of as many professors for six weeks of intensive work on a single subject. The geologists will do field work at the Grand Canyon; the archæologists will make actual excavations in northern Arizona; and the biologists will work from a base laboratory on Mount Lemon. Practical courses in mining engineering, irrigation engineering, and dry-farming at suitable centres are also under consideration. It is conceivable that many who do not need instruction, will gladly avail themselves of the opportunity to join organized, equipped, and directed parties of students bent on first-hand investigation. The concentration on a single subject, the combination of out-door life with professional work, the opportunity for close association with able specialists, and the interesting and comparatively fresh field for investigation, combine to make the project attractive. F. M. Perry

Tucson, Arizona, April 12

An Enlightened Appointment

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: In pleasing contrast to the pessimism of many writers on university administration, I should like to instance a recent appointment at the University of Colorado. When Doctor Livingston Farrand was called to be the executive head of the American Red Cross, the Regents of the University asked the Faculty to appoint a committee to confer with the Board about his successor. A committee of five was elected promptly by the Senate, and after careful consideration, unanimously voted to submit the name of George Norlin, Professor of Greek, who had been a very successful Acting President during the difficult period of the war. After holding a conference with the committee, the Regents appointed Doctor Norlin President of the University of Colorado the same day. Under his guidance the University will combine democracy of government and helpfulness of aim with soundness of scholarship.

I should like to point out also that the Board of Regents responsible for this enlightened policy was elected directly by popular vote. F. B. R. Hellems

University of Colorado, April 10

Disease Running its Course

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: There seems to be a pessimistic bent in the mind of the *Nation*, concerning the present attitude of civilized peoples toward the approaching problems of real social reconstruction—a feeling that not only are England and France unlikely to respond adequately, but that America more especially will drift back into reaction.

The great question to ask at this juncture is, "Are we ready?" One cannot hurry the inevitable. There are, in medicine, some diseases that must be allowed to run their normal course; to show in sequence their normal symptoms. Interference merely puts off the time of restoration. Is it not so with social conditions? Can we say to a well-fed, thoughtless multitude, "Haste! for your life!"? Should we not rather say, "Wait?" Should we not brave the nearer approach of these spectre shapes of want, misery, ruin, greed, extravagance, oppression? Will not a more bountiful measure be ours if we wait instead of beg?

La Jolla, Cal., April 20 William S. Wood

Not Yet Archangels

To the Editor of the Nation:

Sir: I had been rather dreading to open my *Nation* knowing I should put it down with a sinking of the heart, with the question "Who then will show us any good?" I suffered specially because I am convinced you are usually right. Then in looking over Drummond's "Ascent of Man" I found this expression from Victor Hugo: "I am the tadpole of an archangel," which has fortified me to face facts fearlessly. But if I am that dazzling possibility, so is Mr. Burleson, so is Mr. Lodge—and so perhaps is Mr. Lloyd George!

Any way—give us a little more of that "which makes the whole world kin," along with your tonic truthfulness.

Shanghai, China, February 21 Emma J. Ward

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

The Great Adventure

The Diary of a Dead Officer. Being the Posthumous Papers of Arthur Graeme West. London: Allen and Unwin.

ARTHUR GRAEME WEST was born in 1891; in January, 1915, at the age of twenty-three he joined the army as a private in the Public Schools Battalion; in November of the same year he crossed to France, and after four months' service at the front he returned to England to be trained as an officer; in September, 1916, he went to France again with a commission, and served there continuously until, in the early spring of 1917, he was shot through the head by a sniper as he was getting out of a trench. While he was in the army he kept a diary, off and on, which is now printed, together with a few poems, in a small book of ninety-six pages.

The friend who edits West's diary writes: "If its detailed realism serves to correct in some measure the highly colored picture of the soldier's life and thoughts to which the popular press has accustomed us, it will not have been written in vain." It would not; but the value of this small book is far greater than the merely negative achievement suggested by his friend, for it records the history of a man's release from the mists and webs of authority, dogma, and custom, into the realm of free manhood. Rarely has this highest of all adventures been more clearly or more compactly described; and as this adventure is common to the growth of every human being, and is the subject, direct or indirect, of all art, this small book carries with it great creative power and its value is in consequence permanent. Nor is the author's death "irrelevant," as the editor suggests; rather does it put the body of life into a purpose which can never pass away —a purpose gallantly achieved in the teeth of militarists and war. West's book is a triumph of the human spirit, the light of which shows hatred and destruction, on however pompous and vast a scale, to be irrelevant. Here we have the right values of things; here we have truth in its living intensity, which, like Whitman's mouse, is "miracle enough to stagger sextillions of infidels."

The first entry in the diary runs as follows: "The first and chief way in which these experiences offended me was by their irredeemable ugliness. This was horribly intensified, after some month and a half . . . by five of the *faex Romuli* coming into the hut and crowding the number up to over thirty . . . Marches, in which these five were anywhere within one's range of vision or smell . . . stirred in me such a spirit of fermenting malignity that I would cheerfully have killed them . . . Their thick necks, whose lines were so graceless . . . their big flapping ears, the inveterate curl under the hats, their insolent leering expression, or their vaguely wretched stupidity was stirringly noisome." The last entry is this: "A gramophone has occurred during the last day and they play 'The Bing Boys.' But how I love them all . . . We confide our dreams to one another, we talk of the other people in the mess and of the men in our own battalions. It is a sunny day, and against the walls and in sheltered places the heat is pleasant. Out on the E—— road the whole of F—— lies before us; a mist is gathering over it from the surrounding hills and from the chimneys of the jute factory. Little girls pass and repass through the crowd of officers with quiet happy eyes. I am very happy. I love all the men, and simply rejoice to see them going on day by day their own jolly selves, building up such a wall of jocundity around me."

Taken by themselves these passages might have n greater significance than that of a good mood and a bad; but, as they stand, they mark the beginning and the end of a man's progress through terrible circumstance to freedom. Amidst organized cruelty and destruction, when men are trained and disciplined out of their proper nature to hate and to kill, this man attained "the calm within and the light around which make night day"; for he saw for himself, what prophets and poets all down the ages from Jesus Christ to Blake and Shelley and Whitman have seen and taught or sung, that the Kingdom of Heaven is within you, that human nature is worshipful, and that to live and to love are one. His progress was swift and tragic; but he attained the goal. And the record of his attainment, achieved during war's blasphemous denial of life, remains forever a magnificent affirmation in praise of life and humanity; and marks the common path which every man, each in his own way, must tread to gain freedom from the fretful self and entry into the happy scope of the larger life.

The diary is divided into four parts. In the first we have glimpses of a sensitive delightful youth, even more unfit, perhaps, than are most youths to be trained to kill men. He loves books and nature. We hear of him chanting the long haunting lilt of "Love in the Valley"; reading Homer, "Tom Jones," and the "Faerie Queene"; enjoying beauty ("the sunlight lay on the wet cobbles of the road as we came back, outlining all the horses and carts with watery gold"); trying to live his own life in spite of his job. Of this job, too, we have brief glimpses. We see him sodden in the trenches; on a patrol with two others in No Man's Land ("a dangerous business and most repulsive on account of the smells and appearance of the heaps of dead men that lie unburied there as they fell, in some attack or other, about four months ago"). He marvels "how bloody people in England seem to be about peace and peace meetings"; he supposes that "they are getting rather Prussian in the country"; and states that "for the Hun I feel nothing but a spirit of amiable fraternity that the poor man has to sit just like us and do all the horrible and useless things that we do, when he might be at home with his wife or his books, as he preferred." We have here, in fact, the thoughts and experience of countless young men of every nationality, when out a-soldiering in the great European war: one part of themselves killing and suffering because they have been told they must; another part making the pathetic effort to continue their old lives under the altered conditions.

The second section was written while West was being trained for a commission, and therefore under better material conditions. It contains scathing criticisms of the cruelty and stupidity of military methods. One reads "how in hospitals dying men were made to sit up and ordered to smile"—with the comment, "eye-wash for inspections"; about the lecture of a cavalry major "who babbled on about bayonet fighting and physical drill, the C. O. simpering by, keeping a thousand men from their rest and their beer and teaching them nothing"; of the thick insults of the Sergeant-Major; of the treatment of men who had "gone sick"; of the whole senseless business with which millions are now familiar. And from the anguish emerges one cry, twisted from a soul in torment, the truth spoken with bitterness:

"Mankind is perpetually puffing itself up with strange unearthly loyalties and promised rewards. Man goes out to fight for a delusion, to defend what he has tricked up as his Fatherland; he imposes all sorts of restraints and tortures on himself in the name of Virtue and Respectability, sets a fool above him to worship, to crawl on his knees to and shed a ble ing of 'purposefulness' on his most frightful sufferings. There is only one thing real amidst all this decorative garbage, and that is the feeling of pain or pleasure together with thought."

In the third part this truth is seen entering into the writer's own soul, and one reads of his terrific internal struggle to leave the army, a struggle which failed. "I am *almost* certain I do wrong to go on—not quite certain, and anyhow, I question if I a... of martyr stuff." He sees himself "a creature caught in a net," and feels "it would certainly be much pleasanter if I could regard myself still in this rather sublime light as the man who goes into the pit for his friends; but I cannot do so, for I am beginning to think that I ought never to have gone into it at all." He is able to state boldly to himself: "Duty to country and King and civilization! Nonsense! For none of these is a man to be forced to leave his humanity on one side and make a passionate destroying beast of himself. I am a man before I am anything

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

else, and all that is human in me revolts." And finally he comes to the conclusion: "It is from man we must seek our greatest happiness, man the lover . . . It is this great tide of love surging up in one that prompts the feeling of loneliness when the narrow love possible in camp is widened out."

In the fourth part, which opens in the trenches ("a dead German—a big man—lay on his stomach as if he were crawling over the parades down into the trench; he had lain there some days, and that corner of trench reeked even when someone took him by the legs and pulled him away out of sight, though not out of smell, into a shell hole") and describes with great vividness the process of digging for men who have been buried alive by the bursting of a shell, one feels how the new vision has become an i tegral part of his life in spite of the obscenities of the battlefield. He is on solid ground, and can see life as it is through the horror of conditions of life which have been imposed by the greed of men. He can write: "The silver veil of gossamer webs are round my hair, the juice of the Autumn grape gladdening all my veins. I am the child of Nature. I wish always to be so"; and the last entry, dated February 10 (he was shot in April), which has been quoted, shows as nothing else could how he obtained this wish.

A few great artists and thinkers have by their worship of life developed the power of expression to such a degree that they have been able to contribute something to that general Mind of Man from which after-generations draw their life. The scattered pages of this slain boy's diary form a contribution of this kind, which is a supreme privilege for any human being to make. It was not cowardice that kept him in the army; and it was not, as he thought, because he was not of the stuff from which martyrs are made. He was of even finer stuff; he followed a greater purpose, attained by few. He has achieved the simple record of how a human being rises from the ground to his feet, rises to the stature of life's acceptance even when the circumstances of life are foul and cruel; the simple record of all human growth. One of America's and the world's great men has written the truth about such a life and such a death:

"Those corpses of young men . . . those hearts pierc'd by the grey lead,
Cold and motionless as they seem live elsewhere with unslaughtered vitality."

Two Introductions to Dante

Dante. By Henry Dwight Sedgwick. New Haven: Yale University Press.

The Power of Dante. By Charles Hall Grandgent. Boston: Marshall Jones Company.

THE art of writing a popular introduction to a classic is less easy than it looks, notwithstanding the opinion held by many that the very differentia of a classic is its popular appeal. Certainly no student of Dante need withhold his hand because the market is stocked with fascinating little books that make the uninitiated eager to read him. The difficulties in the way of such a book are considerable. The size and complexity of the Divine Comedy, its infinite allusiveness, and the depth and range of its doctrine make the task of the popularizer all but impossible. Tact in omission, skill in generalization, and above all the gift of transmitting a sense of Dante's incomparable vividness, both as thinker and as poet, are the essentials. The difficulty of the task is increased by the impossibility of translating Dante into English—impossibility, that is, for any talent less than Rossetti's. The truth is that none of the standard translations, competent as some of them are, would ever induce an unprepared reader to read Dante for himself. An introduction is needed that shall hit the precise mean between information and inspiration, and that shall succeed in conveying the impression of Dante's spirit as well as the meaning of his words.

This requirement Mr. Henry Dwight Sedgwick's handbook is not far from fulfilling. He calls it "an elementary book for those who seek in the great poet the teacher of spiritual life," which means that he has chosen, out of the various approaches to Dante, the one that seems to him (and to us) the most immediate. If the reader can once be made free of the Dante country, its incidental beauties and benefits will be discovered in their time. Mr. Sedgwick allows a good deal of information, biographical, critical, and allusive, to transpire by the way, but his aim is to pluck out the heart of Dante's spiritual mystery. We quite agree with him that this is the proper approach to Dante in these days when the peculiar lessons that he has to teach are as much needed as ever they were. The reality and primacy of spiritual forces in man's life, the essential unity and order informing both the physical and spiritual universe, above all, the "infinite nature of duty," to use Carlyle's phrase—these are the fundamental ideas with which Dante deals in his poignantly imaginative fashion, and which must somehow be brought home once more to the men and women of our day. This, we think, Mr. Sedgwick succeeds in making plain, and he succeeds besides in giving a fresh, unhackneyed account of the poem that will induce many a reader to subject himself to the spell of Dante's own language and even to learn the Italian tongue for the sake of doing so. Unfortunately, Mr. Sedgwick's versions of the passages that he chooses for illustration seem to us no exception to the rule that we have stated. They do not invite the un-Italianate to read further, and the Italianate they tease with broken echoes of the music that he loves. In his appendix, Mr. Sedgwick considers briefly the various modes of translating Dante—prose, *terza rima*, the stanza of Marvell's famous "Ode to Cromwell," adopted by Mr. Shadwell, and blank verse—and he pronounces in favor of the last. For our part, we should like to see a blank-verse translation in which feminine endings prevailed. It would, at any rate, preserve one element of Dante's music without so great a sacrifice of literalness as *terza rima* usually involves.

The book has many incidental merits, among them an admirably chosen list of passages drawn from the mystics of all ages, with which Mr. Sedgwick illuminates his exposition of Dante's mystical doctrine. We cannot but wonder, however, why a mediævalist of Mr. Sedgwick's rank should quote his parallels so largely from Mr. Bridges's anthology, "The Spirit of Man," and from Miss Underhill's "Mysticism." While the book expressly disclaims any intention to be erudite, this is a departure from the ways of erudition that we deprecate.

Professor Grandgent's Lowell Institute lectures on "The Power of Dante" are also an attempt at popularization, though they appear to assume rather more knowledge of Dante on the part of their readers than does Mr. Sedgwick's handbook; but they are not so likely, we think, to be successful. They are full of interesting things, and, as might be expected, give abundant evidence of expert knowledge; but they are overweighted with translation, or, what is the same thing, they allow Dante too freely to interpret himself. Now Dante does not interpret himself to the uninitiated, especially in translation or paraphrase. He demands, more perhaps than any other great poet, comment and illustration. Indeed, a book of this sort—we mean, of course, from the popular point of view—is almost more difficult than the poem itself, for it lacks Dante's amazing visibility. Mr. Grandgent's translations are, of course, excellent. His experiments in *terza rima* all but convince us that this is the ideal measure for the translation of Dante, so fluent, ingenious, and accurate are they. In a passage of forty-two lines we have found only six short phrases that are not clearly in the original, and in more than one instance the translator has succeeded in reproducing some of Dante's subtlest metrical effects. Mr. Shadwell's strictures upon *terza rima*—that the rhyme-scheme does not please the English ear, that it necessitates "padding," "violent inversions," and "archaic and uncouth expressions"—do not apply to these *terzine*; but the skill and delicacy with which the difficult measure is handled will be appreciated only by readers of Dante's own tongue. We cannot think that the novice will be allured by them to seek initiation into the mysteries of the Divine Comedy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We need hardly say that the lectures are rich in information. In the indications of Dante's reading, the analysis of his metrical technique and of the elements of his style, the illustration of the Divine Comedy by reference to Dante's other works, both Latin and Italian—in such critical ways as these the book is extremely helpful. There are, not infrequently, bits of comment that make us perceive how excellent a piece of interpretation Mr. Grandgent could have given us had he chosen; for example, this remark upon the punishment of those "time-serving neutrals" of whom Dante tells us that they were "to God displeasing and to His foes": "Tormented beyond endurance by trifles (as are always those who put their own comfort above everything else), forever dodging purposelessly to and fro after a flag that leads to nothing, they suffer a punishment that is invested with no dignity and arouses no sympathy." The lecture on Dante's Faith seems to us quite inadequate. When one reflects a little upon the connotation of the word in the thirteenth century, Mr. Grandgent's account of it seems singularly "exterior" and therefore without vitality. It does not—to use Coleridge's expression—"find" us. But we cannot have everything, and the student of Dante may well be content with the aid that Mr. Grandgent's book will give him in his endless and self-rewarding quest.

De Vulgari Eloquentia

The American Language. A Preliminary Inquiry into the Development of English in the United States. By H. L. Mencken. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

IN the intervals when he was not editing the *Smart Set* or abusing Stuart P. Sherman for underprizing Theodore Dreiser, H. L. Mencken, it seems, has long been compiling a work on the vulgar tongue of his fatherland. The task has been large enough to make him, for the time being, nearly humble, and he offers his production as a preliminary study only. He would not be Mencken if he did not, after the manner of the eighties when he was a schoolboy, twit the British a good deal, or, as the vulgar has it, twist the lion's tail; and if he did not considerably belabor the philologians (swat the boneheads) as if they still demanded anything of language except that it follow its amiable, imperious will. He is talking, of course, of an older generation of linguistic experts (highbrows), getting even, perhaps, with pedagogues who tried, happily in vain, to constrict his own enfranchised style. But though he does say some undisputed things rather too solemnly, he has still rendered the vernacular a real service (done it a mighty good turn) by his collection of much hitherto uncollected material and by the fresh, vigorous manner in which he has set it forth (trotted it out, or dished it up).

Himself of course bilingual, like Dante, he has like Dante preferred to expound the vulgate in a more learned dialect, and so has composed his treatise on our American language in English, instead, as he doubtless might have done, of handing us our United States on a John Bull platter. However discrepant his practice may here seem, it comports well enough with his main enterprise. For nothing is plainer than that Mr. Mencken has confused his issue by frequently barking up the wrong tree. The common speech of the United States differs immensely from the language of the London *Times;* but so does it differ from that of the *Times* of New York. So does the common speech of the English disagree with the style-sheets of both the Thunderers, Major and Minor. Actually, there are four elements to be discussed: the more or less accepted American standard, the American vernacular, the accepted English standard, and the English vernacular (or rather, vernaculars, for there are Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and various counties to be heard from). The British vernacular Mr. Mencken hardly touches upon, with the result that he credits the Island speech with less than its share of inventiveness and audacity. You might think he had never heard London cabbies at their compliments. Against the background of conventional speech, English or American, the American vernacular, which is of course more inventive and audacious than the English, stands out vividly indeed, so vividly that Mr. Mencken seems to have been blinded by it into a favorite sin of the grammarians—that is, he has constructed paradigms which are rather more complete and uniform than the facts of American speech warrant, at least north and west of Baltimore. Nor is it quite clear just where Mr. Mencken stands in his notion concerning the true sources of language; he scorns the pundits, as he likes to call people who can read and write, but so does he scorn the bleachers, "that depressing army" of the plain people.

These confusions, however, may be overlooked for the sake of the fine gusto for the vernacular in which Mr. Mencken surpasses all who have written on this theme. Along with wide researches into colonial speechways, much knowledge of sectional and special locutions, and a most competent acquaintance with grammars, dictionaries, monographs, and printers' rules, goes a jolly delight in such masters of language as Ring W. Lardner. There is a brief section on "Proverb and Platitude" which throws a strong light across the national character. "Don't monkey with the buzz-saw," "Don't spit: remember the Johnstown flood," "Root, hog, or die," "Cheer up; there ain't no hell," "Life is one damn thing after another," "Kick him again; he's down," "So live that you can look any man in the eye and tell him to go to hell," "Smile, damn you, smile,"—the national wisdom, the national disposition, and the national rhetoric are exhibited in these compact vernacularities. Mr. Mencken, who only touches this division of his theme, opens tempting avenues here. Nor is he less helpful in his list of words and phrases derived from the national sport—*fan, rooter, gate-money, busher, glass-arm, on to his curves,* among others; and from the national game of chance —*cold deck, kitty, full-house, card up his sleeve, ante up, pony up, cash in, go it one better, chip in;* and from the national drinks—*cock-tail, stone-fence, horse's neck, brandy-champarelle, golden-slipper, whiskey-daisy, blue-blazer, white-plush, red-eye, eye-opener, forty-rod, phlegm-cutter, moon-shine, corpse-reviver.* Roving Americans on some remote classical shore must wince with homesickness at a list of verbal experiments, and successes, like the following: *boiled-shirt, big-bug, spread-eagle, back-number, bottom-dollar, poppy-cock, calamity-howler, fire-bug, grub-stake, pay-dirt, tender-foot, ticket-scalper, prairie-schooner, on-the-hoof, jumping-off-place, bell-hop, down-and-out, gum-shoe;* to say nothing of the still more vivid inventions, *joy-ride, road-house, sob-sister, nature-faker, stand-patter, lounge-lizard, hash-foundry, buzz-wagon, end-seat-hog, shoot-the-chutes, grape-juice diplomacy;* or the gigantic grotesqueries, *sockdolager, hunkydory, scalawag, spondulix, slumgullion, rambunctious, scrumptious, skedaddle, absquatulate* (the last now obsolete without a mourner). No American worthy the name can misunderstand one of these, whether he has ever heard it or not. Have we a sixth sense for the language, or some fourth dimension in our vocabularies? How else account for the popularity of George Ade, who plays upon us very largely with phrases that he has coined himself and yet mean no less than if they were old and honorable? Rabelais could as well compose his roaring epic in American as in the French of his century; our line of talk would make it easy pickings for him. Mr. Mencken, who for all his delight in such Elizabethan exuberance does not go too far in admiring it, has his eye very Americanly on the future. Out of this something must come, he thinks. He points to the example of Ireland, and the fresh, supple idiom built up by John M. Synge and Lady Gregory on the artless speech of peasants. There is, of course, as good reason for pointing to the rambunctious diction of Thomas Nashe (who called Gabriel Harvey a "cotquean and scrattop of scoldes"), John Marston, William Prynne, Nathaniel Ward (who could call a fine lady "the very gizzard of a trifle"), Tom Brown of "facetious memory," or even Slang's prime Dioscuri, Motteux and Urquhart—all dead ones more or less. Maybe somebody in America will deliver the goods and maybe somebody won't.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bolshevist Coup

Ten Days That Shook the World. By John Reed. New York: Boni and Liveright.

MR. REED'S new book is a detailed and illuminating chronicle of events immediately preceding and following the Bolshevist coup in November, 1917. The author was in Petrograd at that time, and his observations are the more valuable because he was familiar with many leading actors of the great historical drama enacted in Russia. But even more important than the author's personal observations, which might conceivably be influenced by his enthusiastic and unconcealed admiration for the Bolsheviks, are the numerous proclamations, appeals, speeches, and newspaper articles both by Bolsheviks and their opponents, with which the book fairly abounds. These will give the thoughtful reader a better understanding of the state of mind of Russia in those hectic days than many volumes of profound or superficial analysis.

One is greatly impressed with the formidable opposition the Bolsheviks had to contend against. Not only the bourgeois classes but nearly all the socialist parties, the democratic organizations, the army committees, and the official labor bodies were opposed to them. Fought, resisted, boycotted, and hindered in every conceivable way, the Bolsheviks seized power, and have retained it for eighteen months in the face of the enmity of the entire world. It is obvious that neither the popular theory of their being German agents nor the oft-repeated charge of rule by tyranny "worse than the Czar's" offers a satisfactory explanation for their success.

By his choice of quotations and by his own remarks Mr. Reed leads the reader to believe that the so-called Bolshevist movement was a natural reaction of the Russian masses against their own weak and irresolute leaders, who were afraid to follow to its logical conclusion the great Russian Revolution which they themselves had helped to bring about. The Provisional Government restored capital punishment on the front when the armies, freed from the oppressive discipline of the lash and the bayonet, had refused to continue to shed their blood in a cause in which they did not believe. It ordered the imprisonment of peasant land committees when the latter attempted to carry out the programme of land distribution which Kerensky's own party had preached for many years. It insisted upon a coalition with parties which were frankly monarchist in their political beliefs and vigorously opposed to such measures as land distribution and workmen's control over industries. The consequence was that the people, war-weary, hungry, and cold, seized upon the Bolshevist solution, "All power to the Soviets!" as the only one capable of insuring their just demands for peace, land, and bread.

Mr. Reed's account of the capture of the Winter Palace, that last bulwark of the Provisional Government, an event which he witnessed, gives an interesting sidelight on the psychology of the Russian revolutionists. When the invaders showed a tendency to loot there were cries: "Comrades! Don't touch anything! Don't take anything! This is the property of the people!" Everybody was ordered out of the building.

"Two Red Guards, a soldier and an officer, stood with revolvers in their hands. Another soldier sat at a table behind them, with pen and paper. Shouts of 'All out! All out!' were heard far and near within, and the Army began to pour through the door, jostling, expostulating, arguing. As each man appeared he was seized by the self-appointed committee who went through his pockets and looked under his coat. Everything that was plainly not his property was taken away, the man at the table noted it on his paper, and it was carried into a little room. The most amazing assortment of objects were confiscated: statuettes, bottles of ink, bed-spreads worked with the Imperial monogram, candles, a small oil painting, desk blotters, gold-handled swords, cakes of soap, clothes of every description, blankets. . . . The culprits either sullenly surrendered or pleaded like children. All talking at once, the committee explained that stealing was not worthy of the people's champions; often those who had been caught turned around and began to help go through the rest of the comrades."

Mr. Reed's personal sketches of leading Bolsheviks scarcely tend to confirm the widespread belief that they are barbarians bent on destruction for its own sake. We learn that Lunatcharski, the "violent" Commissioner of Education (as he is constantly referred to in one of the New York dailies), upon hearing of the bombardment of the Kremlin, broke into tears at the session of the Council of the People's Commissars and rushed from the room crying: "I can not stand it. I can not bear the monstrous destruction of beauty and tradition." He resigned, but withdrew his resignation several days later when he found that the tales of destruction of the artistic treasures of Russia were grossly exaggerated.

The Bolsheviks cannot even be denied the quality of statesmanship, which implies not only knowledge of immediate problems and their solution but also political foresight. In view of the latest development, the possible Allied recognition and support of the Siberian military dictator Kolchak against Soviet Russia, Trotsky's words uttered in November, 1917, seem prophetic: "If Europe continues to be ruled by the Imperialist bourgeoisie, Revolutionary Russia will inevitably be lost. There are only two alternatives: either the Russian Revolution will create a revolutionary movement in Europe or the European Powers will destroy the Russian Revolution."

Comedy

The Emblems of Fidelity. A Comedy in Letters. By James Lane Allen. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company.
The Pelicans. By E. M. Delafield. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
Mockery. A Tale of Deceptions. By Alexander MacFarlan. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.

IF Mr. James Lane Allen has often seemed deficient in that brisker sense of the incongruous which we Americans identify as humor, he here shows himself by no means a stranger to Meredith's Comic Spirit. "The Emblems of Fidelity" is a lettered comedy as well as a comedy in the form of letters: a playful exercise in one of the lighter and politer fields of fiction. There is little in it to attract the reader who is impatient of the elder and more demure humor of a passing generation, and who is so responsive to "O. Henry" as to be bored by the Howells of "The Mouse-Trap" and "The Albany Depot." It is merely a smiling sort of international socio-literary fantasy. Beverly Sands, a young Kentucky-bred novelist, now a New Yorker, models his careful work on that of an elderly and famous English writer, Edward Blackthorne. He is immensely pleased to get a letter from Blackthorne commending one of his novels. The letter has, to be sure, "a string to it." Blackthorne is a collector of ferns, and asks his disciple to send him some of the rare Kentucky specimens that are somewhat vaguely alluded to in the novel. It happens that Sands has not been in Kentucky for many years, and has made up the forest scene out of his fancy. He knows nothing of ferns. However, this is a chance not to be lost, and he promptly commissions a firm of Kentucky florists to ship an assortment to the great man. The earlier letters between the two novelists are over-literary and patently egotistical. They become considerably simpler and more human when mischance and impatience have nipped their budding friendship. Their estrangement whimsically involves the estrangement of Sands and his betrothed, a "temperamental" young woman. Various amusing complications ensue. The pother between the literary pair is straightened out; but the love-tangle is cut, not solved. In the end we perceive that several lives have been apparently changed in their courses through this in itself idle business of the ferns. "The ironic ferns have had their way with us. But after all has it not been for the best? Have they not even in their irony been the emblems of fidelity?" There is a touch here, we perceive, of the rather obscure mysticism which has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

played its part in all of Mr. Allen's later work. It is carried a little further in the closing sentence: "So as we follow the different pathways of our lives which appear to lead toward unfaithfulness to one another, may it not be true that to the Power which sets us all in motion and drives us whither it will all our lives are the Emblems of Fidelity?"

"The Pelicans" is satirical in a more overt way. We cannot feel, with the publisher, that this book represents an advance upon "The War-Workers," far less upon "Zella Sees Herself." One episode is memorable for its unsparing yet not unsympathetic picture of life in an English convent. There was a similar episode, or rather a similar scene, in "Zella Sees Herself," the reader may recall. Frances, being of quite the opposite type, a self-effacing and purely receptive spirit, finds happiness in the life from which Zella recoils. For the rest, the title of the book might well have been "The Egotists," for, with the exception of Frances and one other, every person in the book is primarily concerned with his or her own affairs and importance. One comes to feel that "E. M. Delafield" takes a somewhat monotonous delight in the feline and gallinaceous traits of her own sex. These long conversations between the middle-aged practical Bertha and her dear temperamental friend Nina unnecessarily and tiresomely "rub in" their tendency, quickly established at the outset, to carry on a double monologue of self-praise while darting tooth and claw at each other as frequently and sharply as the pretense of play permits. These are the self-confessed pelicans—those pelicans of myth who fed their young with blood from their own breasts—whose really dominant impulse is to avenge their own loss of youth by tyrannizing over the young who may be in their power. On the whole, the burden of the satire, which in "Zella Sees Herself" rested upon groping youth, is here shifted to the shoulders of obstructive age. The younger generation wins most of the innings, these days! But there is a very modern and Jacques-like school of satirists, or sardonists, who are not to be betrayed into giving a decision for any of the absurd ages of man. The author of "Mockery" is a new practitioner in this kind. His is a "tale of deceptions," deceptions of self and of one's fellows based upon that single-minded pursuit of the main chance, temporal or spiritual, which is variously interpreted, according to the mood and lights of the modern observer, as self-exploitation or self-expression. The main figure, "Mr. Deadly-Earnest Grant," is an eccentric youth of humble origin who is sure of nothing but his own importance. We follow him in his pretentious and unscrupulous stumblings in search of fortune, as religious charlatan, social sponge, and adventurer in the guise of a man of wealth seeking to marry a rich girl, though as far as in him lies he loves a poor one. His creator does not take the trouble to mitigate him in order to engage our sympathy. Whatever his fancies, his conduct is almost invariably determined by the sordid or self-indulgent motive. A bitter comedy is played out between this fellow and the girl he plans to marry for her money. The discovery that she has been playing the same game, fooled by his pretensions to wealth, and that she returns his loathing, gives him at least a momentary glimpse of his paltriness: "He had come through a door suddenly and had met unexpectedly with himself." Only it was on the whole a better version, since the girl had not been so feeble as to deceive herself. She dies, at the end of the strange final scene, a murderess and a suicide, leaving him a legacy of agonized self-realization, in which for the first time he is honest and a man. There is enough of him to love and to be loved, and one perceives a hesitating upward turn to the sardonic smile with which the final sentences of the narrative are spoken: "Somewhere at the foot of the cliffs that mangled counterpart of himself, that almost faithful counterpart whom he had thought of as 'Miss Ward,' was lying at the mercy of the sea. He murmured half to himself: 'My mother was a woman of the people. My father was a wicked tailor. And I—but for the grace of God am there.' . . . That also was true, but Ursola did not understand. To her he had been always perfect. She pressed his hand—reassuringly."

Books in Brief

THE essay as Goldsmith and Lamb knew it—friendly, discursive, accomplished—is well exemplified in John Butler Yeats's "Essays Irish and American" (Macmillan). Robert Louis Stevenson, in spite of his playing the sedulous ape, did not belong to the age of the essay in the way that the writer of this volume belongs to it. John Butler Yeats writes as the Citizen of the World wrote. But he is a Citizen of the World who has taken Blake and Walt Whitman for his scriptures. There are three topics upon which he becomes eloquent—conversation, leisure, and human sympathy. In each of the essays one or two or all three of these topics are brought in. The discussion on the painter Watts and his method brings out this idea: "It seems to me that the genius of portrait-painting is largely a genius for friendship; at any rate I am quite sure that the best portraits will be painted where the relation of the sitter and the painter is one of friendship . . . the technique of portrait-painting is mainly a technique of interpretation." And in his recollections of Samuel Butler he says: "I sometimes think I have lost all my opportunities, the chance of knowing Butler well was one of these. Slowly I have come to feel that affection for human nature which is at the root of all poetry and art, whether the poet be a pessimist or an optimist. Had I stayed much with Butler I should have learnt my lesson almost at once." The fine essay on J. M. Synge glorifies conversation and leisure. "When I used to listen to Synge's conversation, so rare and sudden, as now when I read or listen to what he has written, I can say to myself, 'Here among these peasants is the one spot in the British Islands, the one spot among English-speaking people, where Shakespeare would have found himself a happy guest." And again: "Synge's plays, his prefaces to his plays, and his book on the Aran Islands, like his conversation, describe a little community rich in natural poetry, in fancy, in wild humour, and in a wild philosophy; as wild flowers among rocks these qualities spring out of their lives of incessant danger and incessant leisure." Mr. Yeats is modern in his ideas but not advanced in his views. His delightful essays, "Back to the Home" and "The Modern Woman," should leave radicals gasping. But his tone is far from being Victorian when he speaks of art. "If morality frames for our guidance rules of conduct which, if we do not obey, we are to be punished—if it bids us shun temptation and remove temptation from our path and from the paths of all the world—Art, on the contrary, seems to say, with all its strength and with all its voices: 'Seek temptation; run to meet it; we are here to be tempted.'" The leisure that Mr. Yeats praises, the leisure of a conversational and letter-writing age, is in these essays: these thoughts and the way they are stated suggest long reflection. He can make a statement that goes round the subject as the hand goes round the thing it holds. Thus, having told us of the circumstances that have gone to make the English egoists, he shows us the fine thing that has come out of this egoism. Characteristically, he finds the sublimation of the English egoism in good talk. "Cultivated Englishmen talking together are like men sitting in the woods through a long summer's night and listening during the intervals of silence to the noise made by a near-by stream or of a wind among the branches, or to the singing of a nightingale. So always should mortals talk: clamorous and confident argument are the resource of the intellectual half-breed." Mr. Yeats is made a little sorrowful by the appearance of the modern woman, with her "frantic, brand-new egoism," and by the threatened loss of "the world's two most picturesque figures—the master of the house and its mistress." Where, he asks, as Goldsmith might ask if Goldsmith should revisit us and had learned the language of the romantics, where is the threefold charm of mystery, subtlety, and concealment, under which womanhood was wont to veil its powers? And while so many bow down before this conquering modern woman, where are the poets? Perhaps the women will tell us. Meanwhile, an essayist is grieved.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN "Prime Ministers and Some Others" (Scribners) we are given yet another sheaf of the late George W. E. Russell's collections and recollections. This time the author's special concern is with British premiers, of whom he remembers ten and knows an eleventh; he is content now to write of only nine of these exalted personages. Palmerston he makes very vivid to us. He recalls Lord Granville's description of that flexible politician "wearing a green shade which he afterward concealed" and looking "like a retired old croupier from Baden," and he quotes Mr. Speaker Denison's diverting account of how Palmerston consumed nine dishes of meat at one and the same meal. He draws a striking portrait of Disraeli, "absolutely statuesque," eyeing "his opponent [Gladstone] stonily through his monocle" and then congratulating himself "in a kind of stage drawl that there was a 'good broad piece of furniture' between him and the enraged Leader of the Opposition." Mr. Russell's hero is, of course, the Grand Old Man. Elsewhere in this group of sketches he declares that the great Victorian statesman was "the finest specimen of God's handiwork that he had ever seen." But he is not therefore deterred from commenting on Gladstone's lack of skill in managing his party or even his Cabinet. "He never realized the force of the saying that men who have worked together have only half lived together . . . he understood *Man* but not men." Under the caption, "In Honor of Friendship," Mr. Russell assembles eleven of his intimate studies of eminent churchmen, statesmen, scholars, and writers. This is surely the most valuable section of the book, as it is also the most interesting. Of these biographical papers the most memorable is that upon the late Canon Scott Holland, which in its perfect sympathy and understanding is nothing less than a little masterpiece. Mr. Russell long since achieved distinction as a writer of ecclesiastical biography of the Anglican variety, but he has never done work more finished and delicate than in these few pages in memory of the late Canon of St. Paul's. The studies of Lord Halifax and the late Master of Trinity, Henry Montagu Butler, and the fine Memorial Address on Basil Wilberforce, call almost equally for the highest commendation.

SUCH a volume as Sir William Robertson Nicoll's "Reunion in Eternity" (Doran) comes aptly at a time when the world is full of mourners for the many promising young lives cut short prematurely by the inexorable stroke of war. It is addressed primarily to Christian believers in immortality, to whom it will be rich in assurance and comfort, but is not without appeal to the non-professedly religious in whom the question of a life to come is only one of speculative doubt. On the main theme of the soul's immortality there is no argument. The fact of it is assumed as sure and indisputable, and dwelt upon with the fervent and inspiring eloquence of apostolic faith. So much, of course, is of the essence of all Christian dogma. But the especial significance of the work lies in its effort to prove, what all who believe in an eternal existence most earnestly desire, that the resurrection from the dead is personal and individual, and means the ultimate reunion, with full recognition, of those who die later with the loved and lost who have gone before. This creed, cherished by many saddened souls, is adopted by Dr. Nicoll in its fullest implication, and he strives to buttress it by quotations from the great writers of ancient and modern times who have more or less completely subscribed to it. His wide acquaintance with general literature has enabled him to compile a mass of deeply interesting testimony. From the New Testament, and theologies old and new, he draws largely, but his long array of witnesses selected from the most varied sources is evidence of his broad and scholarly research. As an indication of its scope, allusion may be made to the extracts from Epicurus, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Buckle, Shelley, Spenser, Huxley, Carlyle, and Mazzini. The divines, philanthropists, and many eminent lay men and women contribute pertinent matter, and much space is devoted to famous passages from Browning and Tennyson. The Elizabethan dramatists also pay tribute, as well as scores of others, saintly or otherwise.

THOSE who are searching today for a working conception upon which the League of Nations may rear a solid and lasting foundation should seek elsewhere than in Dr. T. J. Lawrence's "The Society of Nations" (Oxford University Press). For though Dr. Lawrence recognizes the fact that the League of Nations can survive only as the peoples of the world accept the spiritual significance implied in it, he assumes that the League of Nations cannot come into being except through the formulation of an international legal code, to evolve from the codes which obtained in the relations between sovereign nations in 1914. But the League of Nations today must evolve, if it is to survive, not through legal codes, but through the common solutions of economic problems. The only kind of league that can survive is a league born out of the common necessities of the nations, and formed with the sole purpose of meeting and satisfying those necessities. It is rather to economists like J. A. Hobson and H. N. Brailsford that we must turn for practical expositions of the form which the League of Nations should take. Teachers of international law are prone to accept legal documents in place of living realities, and Dr. Lawrence shares this disability together with Professor Raleigh C. Minor, of the University of Virginia, whose work, "A Republic of Nations," bears resemblance to that of Dr. Lawrence. Both of these legalistic writers ignore the most obvious fact in the international situation today, that peoples formulate the law which they consider good for themselves, irrespective of the existence of printed documents, basing that law on the need for satisfying their vital necessities.

AS a vehicle for her errant dreams and vagarious musings, Edna Worthley Underwood chooses the epistolary form of composition, and calls her assembled fragments "Letters from a Prairie Garden" (Marshall Jones Company). They are addressed to an unknown man who, thanks to a tangle in the telephone wires, has accidentally heard her laugh and straightway conceives a desire to correspond with her. Just how the subsequent direct telephone connection referred to in the preface, and necessary to the inauguration of the epistolary interchange, was so readily established between the eager eavesdropper and "the woman who laughs," is not clear to a person of practical mind, though solemn assurance is given of the actuality of the occurrence and the genuineness of the letters. But whether genuine or not, the letters contain, in addition to their dreamland vaporings, much good talk on all sorts of subjects.

THIRD EDITION IN FIRST MONTH!

JOHN REED'S

"TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD"

The only honest, exhaustive, fearless, decent story of the *Bolshevik Revolution*

ALL BOOKSTORES, $2.00
POSTAGE 15c. EXTRA

Boni & Liveright, 109 W. 40th St., N. Y., Publishers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Art

Painting in California

THE first impression given by the galleries of the Palace of Fine Arts during the forty-third annual exhibit of the San Francisco Art Association is one of intelligent emancipation. This is the more surprising because Californians are, as a rule, slow to free themselves by a determining act from the shackles of habit. The proverbial prophet without honor suffers more, perhaps, in places remote from the theoretical centres of culture. In far countries, like California, he is the victim of those misgivings on the part of possible patrons which arise from the fear of appearing provincial—doubts which are of the very essence of provincialism. The Californians who buy pictures, with a few notable exceptions, have always shown a preference for importations that bear a European, or at least an eastern, *cachet*. They do not trust themselves and they do not trust the artists of their own community. In the face, therefore, of this perennial discouragement the artists whose works are displayed at the present exhibition have with spirit accepted the challenge of adventure. The result is a refreshing vitality in pleasant contrast to the academic catalepsy of a few years ago. While this revolution makes it possible to regard Californian art as no longer parochial, its enfranchisement is, however, still largely a matter of exterior influences. If we have still to wait for originality, the present exhibition gives us hope and confidence. We have, moreover, an undeniable guaranty in the work of Henry V. Poor.

Of the eighty-seven painters whose work is displayed, five of those showing more than a single canvas make what may be called a clean score of excellence. Gertrude Partington Albright's painting, "Jack London's 'Glen Ellen,'" marks an extraordinary growth in assertiveness and power, a triumphant escape from the rather insipid early essays in oil by this able dry-pointist. The picture is an unconditional, albeit an adroit, acceptance of the Cézanne tradition, which bars it from consideration on the basis of authority and genuineness; but, in spite of its derivative nature, it is in some ways the most accomplished canvas in the collection. Two really distinguished etchings by this artist show San Francisco romanticized and beautified beyond recognition; but here again we see a dependence upon tradition, for these admirable prints seem to be *tours de force* in the manner of the small-tool copperplates of the sixteenth century.

All six water colors shown by Helen Forbes command admiration, as much for their engaging beauty and fine color as for their free and able workmanship. Miss Forbes is happiest in two small pieces, "Monterey Morning," and "The Martyr." Gottardo Piazzoni shows two canvases—"The Haymakers," a landscape superbly done, and "On the Channel," in which there is a change of manner without loss of that personal style which distinguishes this painter's work.

Henry V. Poor is represented only by a group of lithographs. The four landscapes made on the French front have something of the strength and simplicity that characterize the *croquis* of Lepère. The soldier portraits are skilful, but less unusual. The paintings by Mr. Poor in the permanent exhibition in the Palace of Fine Arts make up for the absence of any new work from him in oils, and establish the high achievement and authenticity of this discriminating painter.

The three water colors by Gladys Marie Hobart display a captivating quality of style that is more a gift than a thing acquired—a style so instinctive that there is little reason to fear that influence will weaken it or abort its promise. Miss Hobart's mastery of color quickens and recreates the spirit.

Anne M. Bremer's "The Blue Bay" and "Sentinels" demonstrate effectively the superiority of her landscapes to her portraits, two of which are also shown. Helena Dunlap's four paintings show, with the exception of her finely delivered "Blind," a certain retrogression from her work done abroad some years ago. Armin C. Hansen exhibits two paintings and a charcoal drawing. The oils are broadly done without the affectations that so often go with the use of a large brush. It is interesting to note how consistently Mr. Hansen gives us color—instead of paint. C. J. Stephens, Lydia Mestre, and Xavier Martinez, with one canvas each, are among those who must be mentioned; but Mr. Martinez's picture, "The Bay," with its two-fold technique of foreground and distance, shows that able artist attempting with some uncertainty a transition from his Whistlerian manner to a more modern method.

While the success of the exhibition is directly due to the quality and particularly to the vitality of the work shown, indirectly it is due to the encouragement of quality and vitality which is a part of the progressive policy of Mr. J. Nilsen Laurvik, the director of the Palace of Fine Arts. Thanks to him we can now cease talking about the art of California and begin to talk about California's place in art.

PORTER GARNETT

Drama

Little Theatres

THE Little Theatre movement is now in its second and perhaps its most difficult stage. The novelty of purpose and appeal is gone. The instigators of a little theatre are no longer pioneers in a trackless and alluring forest. Many paths have been cut and trod during the last eight or nine years and many little ruins mark the milestones for the present traveller. It is not so much the work of exploration as of settling in the new land that confronts the promotors of the little theatre today. Their task is probably a more difficult one than that of their predecessors for their courage is not the courage of ignorance. It is based on real and frequently discouraging experience. To the spirit that knew nothing and tried everything was due much of the early success of the movement. To the same spirit is due the failure of the individual ventures. None of the original little theatres survives today. If their souls go marching on so do their problems.

It is the fashion at the moment to decry the Washington Square Players, to remember their amateurishness, their occasional errors in taste, and to forget the significance of their achievement—a clear case of the evil that men do living after them, the good being interred with their bones. With Maurice Browne's Little Theatre in Chicago, and the Arts and Crafts Theatre in Detroit, the Washington Square Players represent the furthest advance of the insurgent theatre in America. And their achievement was greater than that of the other two, for they confronted bigger obstacles. They laid siege to the most sophisticated and jaded public in America, and they conquered far more ground than is generally admitted. We are glad enough of the old spirit has survived the war to give rise to the new organization which began its career at the Garrick Theatre in April. The Theatre Guild does not claim to be a

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

continuation of the Washington Square Players. It has new policies, based on old lessons, and much new blood. But, as its name implies, it hopes to keep alive the same spirit of co-operation and enthusiasm which animated the earlier organization.

The first bill of the Guild, Benavente's "The Bonds of Interest," sustains this hope, though the production is not an unqualified success. The play they have chosen shows serious artistic intent. It is a fantastic comedy, rich in idea, charm and literary flavor, but it lacks suspense and emotion and demands in their place a delicacy and precision of acting, of which the company is not yet capable. The imaginative quality of Rollo Peters's mounting goes far to create a desired atmosphere, and the players have brought to their work a sincerity and spontaneity which augur well for future productions. In a more vital play the unevenness of the acting, inevitable in so new an organization, would be less apparent. Benavente's artificial and rhetorical c medy demands an exquisite rhythm.

The performance of the Theatre Guild is essentially more satisfactory than that of "Shakuntala," the "Hindu Romeo and Juliet," at the Greenwich Village Theatre. Here again we have the production of a foreign play demanding the creation of an exotic mood and atmosphere. But where the Theatre Guild was choppy, the players of "Shakuntala" were lifeless. Their performance was smooth, harmonious, and perfunctory. The last is the unpardonable sin for the little theatre. The Greenwich Village Theatre is not, strictly speaking, an insurgent enterprise at present, and therein lies its weakness. It lacks the *élan* of a coöperative art movement; it has attained a mediocre professional standard at the loss of its amateur spirit.

Perhaps the most interesting event of the little theatre in New York this season comes out of an entirely amateur organization. The Provincetown Players is a group of authors, actors, and artists, producing plays by their own members without pay or profit. It is essentially a dramatic laboratory, a theatre where the author may try out his own work for his own benefit, before an audience of interested "associate members." Naturally a good many plays of doubtful merit are produced. One can only hope that the author derives sufficient benefit to justify the sacrifice of the audience. But often the anvil of the workshop strikes sparks like "The Widow's Veil," and the sea plays of Eugene O'Neill; and occasionally from it comes a piece of such sincerity and distinction that all the failures and mediocrities seem worth while if they have made this one production possible. Such a piece of work is Susan Glaspell's "Bernice." "Bernice" is not for the commercial stage. It is too subtle, too slow, too real. The characters actually talk, they do not speak for the benefit of the audience. They grope for the solution of their problems with a reality that is actually painful. And their problems are not the problems of the stage but of souls today, the souls of young people seeking reality, and the souls of old people escaping it.

The voluntary character of the Provincetown Players is one of their chief assets. If they reorganize, as is probable, and decide to pay their actors, they must make more money, and the need of money begets a caution in production which limits, if it does not nullify, the purely experimental character of the enterprise. Moreover, to justify a paid company, they will be tempted to give more ambitious productions, which promise a wider appeal, and will be forced to turn, as the Theatre Guild has done, from the immaturity of the native playwright to the finished product of Europe. Now the native character of the laboratory playhouse is of inestimable value. Here is the great feeder for all the other types of art theatres. The various little theatres encourage American drama, the laboratory theatre begets it. In any sincere theatrical undertaking the play must be the thing. All experiments in lighting and production, however suggestive and beautiful, are mere accessories to the fact. Unless the insurgent playwrights of America can keep pace with the insurgent artists and producers, the growth of the little theatre will be transient and not rooted. T. H.

Finance

The Victory Loan and the Bond Market

WITH the number of applicants for the Victory Loan, the Treasury Department will probably end the campaign with from 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 owners of government bonds on its lists. The gain represented by this augmented list is really sensational. In two years American bankers have, as a consequence of the five war-loan flotations, completely reorganized the bond market. America is today the strongest bond market in the world and great interest attaches to the problem of further developing the interest of American investors in security investments. These questions will be answered largely by the future trend of Victory Loan prices.

The present situation has been watched with keen interest by bond experts everywhere who believe that the Victory Bonds may reflect a sufficient stability of price to protect the issue from the sharp reaction which has adversely affected sentiment on the occasions of the previous offerings. The Treasury has handled its war financing admirably, so that it has been possible to sell more than $21,000,000,000 of these issues since May 14, 1917. This total includes the new Victory Loan offering. When the over-subscriptions to the four previous loans are taken into account, as well as the immense public investments in thrift stamps and war savings certificates, nearly $27,000,000,000 of United States Government issues have been subscribed for by the American people.

All four of the Liberty Loan issues have been well placed with the people. The hard work by the Liberty Loan Committees has been effective in arousing the public to the necessity of quickly absorbing every war loan that the public was asked to take. It would be most unfortunate to place a large portion of the Victory Bonds with the banks and the trust companies, since those institutions have enough on their hands in connection with the efforts to finance a revival of industrial activity.

The action of various banks and trust companies in offering to care for the $50 and $100 bonds for which so many millions have subscribed will be of great assistance in promoting the success of this great Victory Loan. The cost to the banks of providing these facilities is insignificant compared with the benefits that are likely to accrue to the banks as a result of the valuable connections formed with the subscribers to the various Liberty Loan issues. These connections have already borne fruit in bringing new deposits to the banks and in advertising to the multitude of small investors the advantages of keeping their money and valuables under lock and key. Arrangements are already under way to provide the public, after peace has been formally declared, with various kinds of bond investments to which the prudent investor could well afford to pin his faith.

WILLIAM JUSTUS BOIES

"WOMEN (Published by Alfred A. Knopf, New York, $1.25 net) is a frank psychological study of the sex . . . in the forceful, flowing, literary style of one of London's best known war correspondents. Pungent, searching, suggestive, provocative."

—*Boston Evening Record.*

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 West Forty-second St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Dallas, H. A. Death, the Gate of Life? Dutton. $1.50.
Liljencrants, Johan. Spiritism and Religion. Devin-Adair. $3.
Mullinix, Fred C., editor. Wit, Wisdom, and Philosophy. St. Louis: Nixon-Jones Co.
Radhakrishnan, S. The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore. Macmillan. $3.50.
Rhodes, D. P. Our Immortality. Macmillan. $2.
Unwin, Ernest E. As a Man Thinketh: The Personal Problem of Militarism. London: Allen & Unwin.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Allen, J. E. The War Debt. London: Methuen.
Andrews, Matthew P. The American's Creed and Its Meaning. Doubleday, Page. 75 cts.
Asquith, H. H., and Others. The Idea of Public Right. Macmillan. $3.
Brown, Arthur J. The Mastery of the Far East. Scribners. $6.
Butler, Ralph. The New Eastern Europe. Longmans, Green. $3.50.
Fitzpatrick, Edward A. Experts in City Government. Appleton. $1.25.
Friedman, Elisha M. Labor and Reconstruction in Europe. Dutton. $2.50
Howe, Frederic C. The Land and the Soldier. Scribners. $1.35.
Kellogg, Walter G. The Conscientious Objector. Boni & Liveright. $1.
Lawrence, F. W. Pethick. A Levy on Capital. London: Allen & Unwin.
Stallybrass, W. T. S. A Society of States. Dutton. $2.
McKeever, William A. Man and the New Democracy. Doran. $1.35.
Myers, William S. Socialism and American Ideals. Princeton Press. $1.
Oppenheim, L. The League of Nations and Its Problems. Longmans, Green. $2.
Penty, Arthur J. Guilds and the Social Crisis. London: Allen & Unwin.
Reid, Leonard J. The Great Alternative: Saner Politics or Revolution. Longmans, Green. $2.25.
Slichter, Sumner H. The Turnover of Factory Labor. Appleton. $3.
Tucker, Irwin St. John. Internationalism. Chicago: The Author.
Wells, H. G. The Idea of a League of Nations. Boston: Atlantic Press. 60 cts.
West, Andrew F. The War and Education. Princeton Press. $1.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Beazley, Raymond; Forbes, Nevill; and Birkett, G. A. Russia from the Varangians to the Bolsheviks. Oxford Press.
Boak, Arthur E. R. The Master of the Offices in the Later Roman and Byzantine Empires. Macmillan. $1.
Bond, Beverley W. The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies. Yale Press. $3.
Clay, Albert T. The Empire of the Amorites. Yale Press.
Scott, James B. James Madison's Notes of Debates. Oxford Press. $2.
Smith, David N. Characters from the Histories and Memoirs of the 17th Century. Oxford Press.
Webster, C. K. The Congress of Vienna, 1814-1815. Oxford Press. $2.
Wiggins, Robert L. Life of Joel Chandler Harris. Nashville: Smith & Lamar. $2.

JUST READY

The League of Nations

The Way to the World's Peace

By

MATHIAS ERZBERGER

Member of the Reichstag, Chairman of the German Armistice Commission

Translated by BERNARD MIALL, 8vo. $2.25 net

The author seized the opportunity (September, 1918), when Germany was breaking up, to show the German people that there was a movement for a League of Nations in Germany. His book calls for compulsory arbitration and disarmament; discusses free trade and economic rights; opens the colonial problem; and calls for freedom of the seas. His draft of a proposed constitution for a league is of especial interest.

Henry Holt & Company, 19 West 44th Street New York

"What is the chief glory of New England?"

You will find the answer, together with a mass of other entertaining information about New England customs, in Professor Kittredge's "The Old Farmer and His Almanack," price, $2.25. Inquire at your dealer's.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

29 Randall Hall, Cambridge, Mass.
280 Madison Avenue, New York City

New York's Chaotic Sky-line—Does it Satisfy? No! Then Read

A ROMANCE OF TWO CENTURIES

By KENNETH SYLVAN GUTHRIE

Romance! Mystery! Adventure! Progress! Humanity!
It is a Mirror of To-morrow, and of your own best beliefs and wishes for the Humn n Race and Yourself;—Look into it!
Every Topic of Interest of the Next Ten Years Discussed. Settlement of World-wide Democracy. The World-Capital. Future New York! Civic Consciousness! Gripping Climax!

Send $1.65 to EMPFIELD PRESS, 292 Henry St., N. Y. City

A Daughter of Two Worlds

By LEROY SCOTT

How pretty Jennie Malone rose to the upper world of New York society. Illustrated. $1.60 net.

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY, Boston

IMPRESSIONS OF THE KAISER

BY DAVID JAYNE HILL

First hand revelations of the German Emperor. $2.00

HARPER & BROTHERS
Established 1817.

BINDER FOR THE NATION

To receive the current number in a convenient (temporary) form. Substantially made, bound in cloth, with THE NATION stamped on the side in gold. Holds about one volume. Papers easily and neatly adjusted. Sent, postpaid, on receipt of $1.00. Address The Nation, 20 Vesey Street, New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CVIII NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 3, 1919 No. 2809

The Problem of Albania

I. Albania and Self-Determination

By C. A. CHEKREZI

THE Albanian question is once more before the world's tribunal. This time it has been introduced to the Peace Conference by M. Venizelos, who has included in the territorial claims of Greece a demand for that part of Albania which has been commonly known as southern Albania, but which the Greeks have called, since 1912, northern Epirus, the former term having proved offensive to Greek aspirations.

By its geographical and strategical position on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, just opposite Italy, Albania has become an object of intense covetousness on the part of its neighbors, great and small. The various Balkan states, Serbia, Greece, Montenegro, and, to a lesser extent, Bulgaria, have been eyeing the Albanian territories ever since they resolved upon a policy of expansion.

When Austria-Hungary was still on its feet, Albania figured as one of the important items of the *Drang nach Osten* policy. To occupy Albania or bring it within the orbit of the Pan-German policy was the object of the diplomats at Vienna.

For a similar reason Italy, the ally and rival of Austria-Hungary, was likewise deeply interested in Albanian affairs. But as both Powers were eager to get the whole of the coveted object and neither of them would be satisfied with any part of it, they were forced to conclude an agreement, as early as 1900, by which they undertook to refrain from interference and to guarantee the independence and integrity of Albania "in the case of the disruption of the Turkish Empire." This secret understanding explains why no action was taken by these two Powers, so keenly interested in the fate of Albania, in the spring and summer of 1912, when the Albanians won from the Young Turks, at the point of the bayonet, their administrative autonomy, and when a little assistance, diplomatic at most, on the part of Austria and Italy might easily have secured Albanian independence for all time. In reality, it seemed at that time that the two Powers were displeased at the independent action of the Albanians, because the Turkish Empire was not as yet disrupted.

But when the allied Balkan states brought about the disruption of European Turkey in the fall of the same year, Austria and Italy hastened to intervene in order to save Albania from being partitioned among the several Balkan Powers. As matters stood, however, Europe could not possibly ignore entirely the territorial claims of the Balkan allies, and, as possession is nine points of the law, about one-half of the whole territory of Albania was divided between Serbia, Montenegro, and Greece. To Albania, which was presently made an independent sovereign neutralized principality, was left only a narrow strip of territory along the Adriatic, just large enough to conciliate Austria and Italy, whose interests were principally centred on the Albanian coast.

To this new principality Austria and Italy assigned as sovereign a German princeling, William of Wied, who proved to be the pitiable and pathetic victim of Austro-Italian wire-pulling. As a Turkish province Albania had been more or less immune from the bitter rivalry which now broke out between Austria and Italy. The situation became so acute that during the night of May 22, 1914, the two rival squadrons, which had been at anchor in the Bay of Durazzo ever since the arrival of Prince William, cleared for action against each other.

Consequently it was quite natural that Italy should get the upper hand in Albania immediately upon the entrance of Austria-Hungary into the fateful European war. The Prince of Wied, whom the Austrian yacht *Taurus* had brought to Durazzo, was on September 3, 1914, shipped back to Germany aboard the Italian yacht *Misurata*, after six months of inglorious reign.

Now that the Austrian Empire has disappeared from the field of diplomacy and international politics in the Balkans, there remain only Italy and the smaller Balkan states.

Italy occupies today the major part of the territory of Albania. The remainder is under the military occupation of French troops, including the thriving but luckless republic of Korcha or Korytza, southeastern Albania, and the district of Scutari.

The attitude of Italy toward Albania raises puzzling questions. The Italian Government has never clearly defined its policy in that respect. It has been currently said, and the Associated Press has recently corroborated the view, that Italy desires a protectorate over Albania, together with the perpetual occupation of Valona with an adequate hinterland. Yet the Italian Government has always pleaded that "real independence" should be granted to Albania, and the nationalist organ at Rome, the *Unitá*, has emphatically declared that Italy should renounce Valona, but should coöperate with the Albanians in defending this all-important port.

A still more perplexing event, in view of the attitude of Italy toward Albania, occurred on December 25 last, when a National Albanian Assembly, composed of delegates from all the sections of Albania occupied by Italian troops, was allowed to convene at Durazzo and form a provisional Government under the presidency of Turkhan Pasha, formerly Albanian Premier, with the Catholic Prince of Mirdita, Prenk Bib Doda, as vice-president, and with a coalition Ministry in which the Nationalist party holds the majority of seats. It is interesting to note at this point that a Minister for Foreign Affairs was appointed, although such an office is quite out of accord either with the conception of a

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

protectorate or the secret Treaty of London, which latter specifically provides that "Italy is entrusted with the conduct of the foreign relations of Albania." On the other hand, there is no Minister of War. The new Minister for Foreign Affairs stated to the Italian press that the policy of the Albanian Government was to reclaim the independence and territorial integrity of Albania, yet it is difficult to understand what is meant by territorial integrity while Valona remains in the hands of the Italians. The National Assembly also elected a peace delegation of five members, but so far only two delegates have been allowed to proceed to Paris. In addition, the formation of this Government seems to have been branded as a secret transaction, inasmuch as very little has been published about either its constitution or its activities.

It is, therefore, impossible to say anything definite as to what Italy is going to do in regard to Albania.

As opposed to Italian demands, M. Venizelos has put forward the territorial claims of Greece, which include a portion of southern Albania. The Greek Premier argues from two premises. In the first place, he claims southern Albania, or northern Epirus, on the ground that there are in that territory 120,000 Greeks as against 80,000 Albanians. This division into Greeks and Albanians is very characteristic of the Greek point of view. By Albanians M. Venizelos apparently understands Moslem Albanians, whereas by Greeks he means Christian Albanians belonging to the Greek Orthodox Church, inasmuch as he admits that the majority of these 120,000 Greeks speak Albanian. It is unnecessary to unravel this tangle, for all of the 200,000 inhabitants of southern Albania are Albanians, either Christian or Moslem.

In the second place, M. Venizelos claims southern Albania on the ground that the Entente Powers promised it to Greece as a compensation for the Italian occupation of Valona. It is significant that both Italy and Greece base their claims on apparently secret understandings. At any rate, the Greek claims have been referred to the mixed committee of the Peace Conference, which is composed of two delegates from each of the Great Powers, with the exception of Japan. What this body will do cannot be forecast, but in the meantime negotiations are going on between Italy and Greece with the object of settling things amicably. Very likely the suggestion of Signor Bissolati to the effect that Italy should cede the Dodecanesos to Greece in return for territorial concessions to Albania in the south may be taken as the basis of a compromise, although that would impose upon Albania new burdens and obligations toward Italy.

Meanwhile the situation is reaching a climax in northeastern Albania, particularly in those territories which were ceded to Serbia and Montenegro in 1912. A revolution, centring at Gjakova, has been in progress ever since last December, and the Albanian insurgents have driven out the Serbian and Jugoslav forces from many important cities and districts. Even the women are fighting against the foreign rule. This is what the sinister compromises of the London Conference have accomplished. More than a million people are in arms clamoring for union with their mother country, creating a new problem for the Peace Conference.

Complicated as the problem of Albania appears, there can be no question but that it would be simple if the principle of self-determination were genuinely carried out. The compact and homogeneous population of the country indicates the rational way to the settlement of the problem for all time.

II. The Question of Northern Epirus

By THEODORE P. ION

AN important point at issue between Italy and Greece, aside from the question of the twelve Greek Islands, or Dodecanesos, now under the military occupation of Italy, is the question of northern Epirus, the region to which Austrian and Italian diplomacy have for political reasons given the appellation of southern Albania.

Long before the war the Governments of Italy and Greece, by what may be called a self-denying ordinance, had undertaken not to encroach upon the region bordering the Adriatic and Ionian Seas, which was then under Turkish dominion. The territory which at that time was the apple of discord between Austria and Italy consisted of the vilayets or Turkish provinces of Scodra and Yannina, the former being generally known as Albania and the latter as Epirus. For many years the Governments of Austria and Italy urged the Albanians to agitate for the creation of an Albanian state, in which Epirus as far as the gulf of Preveza should be included. Both of these Powers acted on the assumption that such a state would be controlled by them—the northern part, Albania by Austria, and the southern, Epirus, by Italy.

Passing over Austria, with which we are not now concerned, what were the grounds advanced by the representatives of Italy during the London Conference of 1913 for the inclusion of Epirus within Albania?

For a long time Italy, in its eagerness on the one hand to protect itself against Austria-Hungary, and, on the other, to satisfy the imperialistic desires of a considerable group of politicians, coveted the whole Turkish coast of the Adriatic and Ionian Seas, including the hinterland; but as this desire was not attainable on account of the opposition of Austria, the Italian Government limited its plans to the southern part of the region, Epirus, from the Gulf of Valona down to the Gulf of Preveza. The lengths to which the Italian Government went in order to attain its aim are remarkable. Christian Italy was to be seen attempting to transform Christian Epirus into a Mohammedan province. In 1879, for example, the Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs entered into an agreement with the Turkish governor to colonize Epirus with Mohammedan Albanians. The intrigue was brought to light by an English statesman, the late Sir Charles Dilke, who made public the intercepted letter of Count Corte, the Italian consul at Preveza, in southern Epirus, to Mouktar Pasha, at that time Turkish governor of the province. It has been the fixed policy of Italian Ministries in the last few decades to take Epirus under the direct or indirect control of Italy, and Italian diplomacy has not swerved from that policy up to the present time.

The occupation of the country by the Greek armies during the Balkan war of 1912, accordingly, was viewed with marked displeasure by the Italian Ministry, and it was for that reason that Italy, in conjunction with its former ally, Austria-Hungary, endeavored to thwart the efforts of Greece and of the Epirots themselves for the annexation of the province to Greece. Thanks to the stand taken by France, with the support of England and Russia, at the London Conference of 1913, a compromise was effected under which Greece was permitted to keep the southern part of Epirus,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while the northern part was nominally incorporated with the newly-created state of Albania.

The main argument of both Austria and Italy has always been that the people living in the region are not Greeks, but Albanians. Passing over the purely historical aspect of the question—which, however, favors the contention of the Epirots that their country from ancient times has been Greek—and coming to more modern times, it may be pointed out that Epirus, during the dark days of Turkish tyranny, remained one of the principal centres of the revival of the Hellenic language and literature. The existence of numerous schools, attended by thousands of pupils who still study the Iliad or the Odyssey in the language of Homer, and the continuity of the Greek tongue in its modern form both in ordinary speech and as a medium for commercial intercourse, are conclusive proofs that the country has preserved its Hellenic character. A striking illustration of the attachment of the Epirots to Hellenism is the fact that many of the educational institutions which adorn the city of Athens are due to the munificence of these same Epirots. The Epirots also evidenced their national consciousness by taking part in the war for Greek independence, and they submitted to the same sacrifices as the Greek people of the mainland for the creation of Hellas.

That the Epirots themselves repudiated the Austro-Italian contention was clearly shown during the "peregrination" in Epirus of the delegates of the European concert, who, following the decision of the London Conference in 1913, sought to "discover" the nationality of the inhabitants of northern Epirus. It was then that the representatives of Italy amused their colleagues by attempting to prove the nationality of the people by searching out in their homes Albanian-speaking grandfathers and grandmothers, on the plea that that fact ought to be taken as a criterion of the nationality of the people, it being apparently immaterial that the children and grandchildren spoke Greek and declared that they were Greeks and not Albanians.

That speech is not an entirely safe criterion for determining the nationality of a people may be shown by various actual instances. People of the island of Corsica, for example, although speaking an Italian dialect, have always been and continue to be staunch Frenchmen. The inhabitants of the Channel Islands, although Norman by descent, are French by speech and as thoroughly British as are the English. The case of the people in Alsace, in some parts of which German is more prevalent than French, is too well known to require comment. The Near East is also replete with examples of the same sort. The Greeks of the interior of Asia Minor, who are not less ardent Hellenes than are those of Hellas, still use Turkish, although the new generation knows the Greek language. The same may be said of various peoples inhabiting the Balkan peninsula, among whom speech is not always a determining factor in their nationality, or, at any rate, does not prove their attachment to the nationality whose language they speak.

It is for these reasons that distinguished authorities on international matters, with the exception of some German jurists, hold that the principal factor in determining nationality is national consciousness, or, to use the more common expression of today, self-determination. As Sir Charles Dilke said, referring to the Italian intrigue in Epirus: "Race is a small thing by the side of national spirit, and in national spirit the Greeks are as little Slavs as the Italians are Teutons." Moreover, all the Epirots know Greek. It is the only language used by them in commercial transactions and correspondence. It is the only language studied by them in the schools. It is through that language that they attained the high position which they hold in letters and in trade in all parts of the world, and it is precisely this language that Italy now seeks to replace by the Albanian jargon.

After the failure of the delegates of the Great Powers, because of the stand taken by their Italian and Austrian colleagues, to agree to regard the Epirots as Albanians, the Conference of London, in order to avoid a world conflict, acquiesced in the Italian and Austrian demands, and arbitrarily included northern Epirus in the Albanian state which recently has either ceased to exist or at best exists only in theory. It was because of that decision that the Epirots took up arms in defiance of the verdict of Europe, being ready to sacrifice their lives if their country was to be incorporated with Mohammedan Albania. Europe, accordingly, yielding to the armed appeal of these liberty-loving people, devised a *modus vivendi* by granting them autonomy.

At the beginning of the war, Greek forces occupied northern Epirus at the request of the Entente Powers and with the consent of Italy. After the occupation of Thessaly, however, in May, 1917, by the Allied troops, for the purpose of dethroning Constantine, the Italian army, on the pretext that it feared an attack from the troops of Constantine, occupied Epirus and Yanina, the capital. The Italian Government was at this time openly supporting Constantine, and the Italian press was jubilant over the turn of affairs in Greece, the newspapers expressing frankly the view that the maintenance of Constantine on the Greek throne was to the interest of Italy, and deprecating strongly the overthrow of Constantine and the success of M. Venizelos and his party. It was due to the strong opposition of the British and French Governments that Italy subsequently withdrew its troops from southern Epirus, but it maintained its hold on northern Epirus in the hope of making it another Ethiopia or Libya.

The argument which some Italian publicists employ, to the effect that Greece, imitating Italy (which, it is asserted, sacrificed Savoy and Nice in 1866 in favor of France), should renounce its claims both to the Dodecanesos and to northern Epirus, rests upon cases which are not in the least analogous. Italy did not cede Savoy and Nice to France without compensation, since it was due to the victory of the French armies over Austria and the sacrifices which that war had entailed upon France that Italy at that time succeeded in freeing a large part of the Italian Irredenta from the Austrian yoke. Further, in the case of Savoy and Nice, the inhabitants of those places, having been consulted by referendum, voted for union with France. Italy, on the other hand, with the exception of a handful of Garibaldi's followers and a few others, who helped Greece during the war with Turkey, has not only extended no help to Greece in the past, but has continued its efforts to prevent the unification of the Greek people.

The people of Epirus, like those of the Dodecanesos, have at various times and in various ways expressed their desire to be incorporated with Greece, and they in fact abhor the idea of being under Italian rule. The Epirots, in the course of 1915, sent elected representatives to the Greek Parliament, but on account of the diplomatic difficulties which would have been created, the representatives were not ad-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitted to Parliament during the Ministry of M. Venizelos, and they were only tentatively accepted as representatives by the subsequent Parliament. It is for these reasons that Great Britain and France, in the secret treaty of April 15, 1916, left the delimitation of the frontiers of Albania to the coming Peace Conference.

How Italy, basing its claim on the principle of nationality, can incorporate the Austrian provinces which are inhabited by Italians, or how it can take under its rule populations in violation of the same principle, is difficult to see. President Wilson, in his speech of July 4, 1918, declared that one of the ends for which the peoples of the world were fighting, and "which must be conceded them before there can be peace," was "the settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship, upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned." Baron Sonnino cannot go to the Peace Conference holding in one hand Mancini's essay on the "Principle of Nationalities," and in the other Machiavelli's "The Prince."

The sooner the Italian nationalists realize the force of Mr. Wilson's words, the sooner the Entente Powers impress upon the Italian Government the advisability of abandoning a policy of unjust expansion, the better it will be for Italy and for the Allies themselves. In the words of Mr. Gladstone, "Italy cannot honorably undertake engagements which might bind her to aid in suppressing anywhere the popular will by military force."

The Future of Kiaochow

By G. ZAY WOOD

WHAT is to be the future of Kiaochow, the territory which Germany leased from China in 1897 for ninety-nine years, and which was captured by the Anglo-Japanese forces at the outbreak of the war? The question has been comparatively little discussed in this country, perhaps because it seems to have been taken for granted that Japan, the present holder of the territory, would either keep it after the war or else return it to China in return for certain compensations. The question, however, is not quite so simple. There are already indications that at the peace table the Kiaochow question has provoked a lively debate in which China, Great Britain, and Japan have urged their several views. Germany also has an interest in the matter as the lessee of the territory. No matter what may be the national aspiration or pretension of one Power or the just claims of another, however, there is of course only one right way. Like other leased territories in China, Kiaochow is the creation of compact, and its disposition is a question of law. If the question is not to be further complicated, politics and diplomacy ought not to have any weight in the decision.

A brief recital of the history of this territory and its capture by the Anglo-Japanese forces is sufficient to make the question clear. In 1897 two German missionaries were killed in the prefecture of Tsao-chou-fu, in Shantung province, by some Chinese fanatics. As a result of this incident a series of demands was made on the Chinese Government by the German Minister at Peking, one of which was the lease of Kiaochow Bay as "a place on the Chinese coast for the repair and equipment of German ships and for the storage of materials and provisions for the same." The Tsung-li-Yamen refused to accede to this demand, and on November 10, 1897, while the negotiations were pending, Admiral von Diederich arrived at the entrance of Kiaochow Bay with his fleet, and on the 14th took possession of the bay and the territory at its mouth in the name of the German Emperor. The Chinese Government had no choice but to yield as gracefully as possible, and accordingly a zone of 100 Chinese miles (fifty kilometres) surrounding the Bay of Kiaochow was leased to Germany for ninety-nine years. Germany was given the right to erect fortifications on the leased territory and to construct two lines of railway in Shantung province. Germany on its part, it is important to remember, engaged "at no time to sublet the territory leased from China to another Power."

Before the European war was many days old, it became evident that the presence of German armed forces in the leased territory made it impossible to maintain peace in the Far East. China, well aware of the danger of being drawn into the war and used as a battle-ground, as happened in the Russo-Japanese War, appealed to Japan and to the United States for help in maintaining its neutrality. The appeal was of no avail. On August 15, Japan "advised" Germany by means of an ultimatum that the latter should hand over its armed forces, as well as the leased territory, to Japan not later than September 15, with the ultimate view of restoring the territory to China. Nothing had been heard from Germany when, on August 23, the ultimatum expired. The Japanese Imperial rescript declaring war on Germany was issued the next day. In the meantime, on August 22, the day before the ultimatum expired, the Japanese Minister at Peking took the trouble to reassure China, stating verbally that in case Germany did not comply with the demands of the ultimatum, Japan would be compelled to occupy Kiaochow, with a view to its eventual restoration to China.

Military operations began shortly, with British forces participating. It did not take long to reduce the fortresses of Tsingtao, and on November 7 the entire German garrison capitulated. The leased territory has been under Japanese military occupation ever since. On May 25, 1915, the so-called Treaty of Peking was signed between China and Japan, as an outcome of the notorious twenty-one demands. The first article of the treaty provided that "the Chinese Government agrees to give full consent to all matters upon which the Japanese Government may hereafter agree with the German Government relating to the disposition of all rights, interests, and concessions which Germany, by virtue of treaties or otherwise, possesses in relation to the province of Shantung." In one of the notes exchanged, Japan undertook to restore Kiaochow to China on condition (1) that the whole of Kiaochow Bay be opened as a commercial port, (2) that a concession under the exclusive jurisdiction of Japan be established at a place designated by the Japanese Government, and (3) that if the foreign Powers desired it, an international concession should be established. To all intents and purposes, therefore, Japan was to restore Kiaochow to China if the latter carried out the stipulated conditions.

It must be borne in mind that when the treaty was signed China was neutral. There is no doubt but that China entered into the agreement on the assumption that it would remain neutral throughout the war, and that, in consequence, it would have no voice in the Peace Conference at which the Kiaochow question would be settled. The course of events has proved that China was wrong in this assumption. On

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

March 12, 1917, China severed diplomatic relations with Germany because of the submarine warfare, and on August 14 declared war on Germany. The question at once arises as to whether or not the declaration of war by China *ipso facto* abrogated the lease. The ultimate disposal of the Kiaochow leased territory will necessarily be narrowed to this issue. If the lease is not abrogated by the declaration of war, then it is merely suspended for the duration of the war and revives on the restoration of peace. The settlement, then, will be one between China as the lessor, Germany as the lessee, and Japan as the military occupant. It is possible that in that case the conditions agreed upon between Japan and China in the Treaty of Peking and in the notes subsequently exchanged might be carried out. On the other hand, if the lease is abrogated, then the territory should be returned to China unconditionally, for Germany ceases to be the lessee or to have any right to the territory, and Japan is left as the occupant of territory which is no longer German. In that case, the international law doctrine of *uti possidetis* would govern, since Japan has obviously no right to keep what does not belong to her enemy, and the provisions of the treaty and the notes would not retain validity, since the implied circumstances and the matters under which the agreements were made have ceased to exist.

The general rule of international law is that war terminates all existing treaties between belligerent Powers except such as relate to boundaries, to the tenure of property, to public debts, etc., which are permanent in their nature. Treaties which are transient in character, and look to the continuance of a state of peace for their enforcement, are usually considered as having been dissolved by subsequent war between the contracting parties, while those of a permanent nature are regarded as merely suspended for the duration of the war. Is the Kiaochow agreement under which the lease was granted by China permanent in its nature, or does it settle anything permanently? The fact that it is only a ninety-nine year lease is sufficient to show its temporary character. The second article of the Convention provides that "with the intention of meeting the legitimate desire of his Majesty the German Emperor, that Germany, like other Powers, should hold a place on the Chinese coast for the repair and equipment of her ships, for the storage of materials and provisions for the same, and for other arrangements connected therewith, his Majesty the Emperor of China cedes to Germany on lease, provisionally for ninety-nine years, both sides of the entrance of the Bay of Kiaochow." It seems evident, therefore, that the Kiaochow agreement is not permanent and does not settle anything permanently, and that China's declaration of war has abrogated the lease.

Again, war is a hostile measure which terminates all the usual friendly relations between states. All treaties of amity and commerce are *ipso facto* abrogated by a subsequent war between the contracting parties. In this case, the lease was granted to Germany with the intention of strengthening the friendly relations between Japan and Germany. The Convention provides in its preamble that "the incidents connected with the mission in the prefecture of Tsao-chau-fu, in Shantung, being now closed, the Imperial Chinese Government considers it advisable to give a special proof of their grateful appreciation of the friendship shown to them by Germany. The Imperial German and the Imperial Chinese Governments, therefore, inspired by the equal and mutual wish to strengthen the bonds of friendship which unite the two countries, and to develop the economic and commercial relations between the subjects of the two states, have concluded the following separate convention." No matter how ironical the wording of the treaty or how little truth there was in its statements, it was nevertheless a treaty of amity, and as such it was undoubtedly abrogated by the war. Those who have held the contrary have evidently understood the ninety-nine year lease as an absolute cession. It is, however, important to remember that, in leasing the territory to Germany, China reserved to itself "all rights of sovereignty in the zone."

It remains to inquire what effect the declaration of war by China had on the Treaty of Peking. It is a part of the law of nations that a treaty becomes null and void when a state of things which formed the basis of the treaty and one of its tacit conditions ceases to exist, or when the object of the treaty disappears. Has there been such a vital change of circumstances since the conclusion of the treaty as to justify the position that the treaty has become null and void? In other words, has China's participation in the war justified it, from the point of view of international law, in taking back the German leased territory without fulfilling the conditions stipulated in the Chino-Japanese treaty?

In the first place, it is necessary again to bear in mind that when the Treaty of Peking was signed and the notes exchanged in which the disposition of Kiaochow and the German property therein was agreed upon, China was a neutral state on equally good terms with Japan and Germany. It had not, as was said, the least idea of ever being drawn into the conflict, and it was undoubtedly on that ground that China was unwittingly cajoled into the belief that it would not have a seat in the Peace Conference. Japan undertook to speak for China, and all that was necessary, accordingly, was for China to consent to whatever arrangements Japan might make for Germany after the war. With the entrance of China into the war, however, this fundamental understanding underwent a radical change. China ceased to be neutral and became an active belligerent. Both the implied and expressed conditions of the treaty were entirely changed, because the state of things which formed the basis of the treaty in one of these conditions had ceased to exist.

It is of little consequence in this connection to inquire whether or not the entire Treaty of Peking is void. Some authorities on international law hold that the stipulations of a treaty are inseparable; others take the position that treaty stipulations are different and therefore separable, and that the nullity of one does not necessarily mean the nullity of all the others; while still a third group of authorities make a distinction between principal and secondary articles, regarding the voidability of the principal articles only as destructive of the binding force of the entire treaty. Whichever may be the right view, the question is here not material. It is sufficient to point out that, so far as the article relating to the transfer of the German concessions and properties is concerned, and in so far as the implied conditions under which this article was agreed upon and the notes were exchanged have been radically altered, China is no longer bound by the treaty or by the conditions stipulated in the notes. In other words, China may by law claim at the peace table a free hand in the disposition of Kiaochow, or at least some conditional restoration. As a foreign and independent nation, China is entitled to the full benefit of international law in this case.

BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A further justification of the position and claims of China is found in the text of one of the notes exchanged, and in the circumstances which existed at the time of the reduction of Tsingtao in 1915. In the negotiations relating to the twenty-one demands, Japan obtained from the Chinese Government a pledge that the Shantung province and its coast should not be alienated. This pledge was embodied in one of the notes exchanged on May 25, 1915, which reads: "Within the province of Shantung or along its coast no territory or island will be leased or ceded to any foreign Power under any pretext." The pledge was evidently directed against Germany, but there is nothing in its language which prohibits its application to Japan. As a matter of fact China, in pledging itself not to lease or cede any territory in Shantung or along its coast to any foreign Power under any pretext, certainly had all foreign Powers in mind, including Japan. To insist, therefore, that Kiaochow could be restored to China only on condition that an exclusive concession under Japanese jurisdiction be granted or an international concession established, is entirely incompatible with the pledge of non-alienation.

In this connection it may be noted that Japan, in exacting the stipulation just mentioned from China, deliberately ignored its ally, Great Britain, with which it had joined in the Tsingtao expedition. It must be remembered that the capture of Tsingtao, which led to the general surrender of Kiaochow Bay by Germany, was not the work of any one Government or any one army. The military expedition was a joint affair, and the capture was a joint enterprise between the British and Japanese forces. Although the military occupation of the territory since that time has been undertaken by Japanese forces alone, Great Britain has not forfeited its position as a partner in the enterprise. In compelling China to agree to consent to all matters upon which the Japanese Government may hereafter agree with the German Government, and to grant "an exclusive concession under Japanese jurisdiction," Great Britain may or may not have been consulted. But unless an affirmative answer has been officially returned, it is a safe assumption that she has not been consulted.

Kiaochow should undoubtedly be restored to China without condition. War between China and Germany has abrogated the lease; the abrogation of the lease has in turn invalidated the Treaty of Peking; and any concession in any form would be likely to revive the territorial scramble for territory and to perpetuate the régime of spheres of influence in China. Of all things which the Peace Conference ought to avoid, none is so dangerous to the future peace of the world as a revival of the old land-grabbing policy which European Powers have long practiced in their diplomatic dealings with China. Politics and diplomacy should not be allowed any weight in the settlement. Kiaochow should be disposed of according to law.

Contributors to this Issue

C. A. Chekrezi is the delegate from Albania in the United States.

Theodore P. Ion, director of the American-Hellenic Society, is acting as an advisor to the Greek delegation at the Peace Conference.

G. Zay Wood is a student of international law and politics.

Documents

A German Plan for a League of Nations

THE draft printed below of a plan for a League of Nations was drawn up by the German Society for International Law and submitted by it to the Government. A summary of its provisions was published in the London *Times* of February 3. The draft was the work of a committee comprising a considerable number of experts and divided into eleven sub-committees. A special scheme dealing with international labor law in the peace treaty, prepared by a committee on social policy, has not yet come to hand. It will be noted that the plan ignores the international law of war, taking the view that war and the League of Nations are irreconcilable ideas, that the code of the League of Nations must not recognize war as a legal condition, and that war must be treated as an action contrary to international law and hence a violation of the terms of the League, so far as states which form the League are concerned. The text here given is translated from the *Frankfürter Zeitung* of January 26.

I

Principles

Article 1

The object of the League of Nations is to secure a lasting peace, based on the moral power of right and the independence and inviolability of all states, and to promote the welfare of the peoples by common work.

Article 2

Special political alliances and secret treaties shall be prohibited.

Article 3

State agreements of every kind shall be communicated forthwith to the permanent Committee of the League of Nations, which shall publish them in an official organ.

Article 4

Declarations of war may be made only with the consent of the Parliaments. States belonging to the League of Nations which do not yet possess a provision to this effect in their Constitution shall be bound to make the provision at once.

II

Constitution

Article 5

The League of Nations shall be open to all states with an established Constitution.

The Papal See shall occupy a position in the League of Nations corresponding to its special importance.

Article 6

It shall not be permissible to withdraw from the League without the consent of the Congress of the League.

Article 7

The following shall be organs of the League:

(a) The Congress of the League;
(b) The permanent Committee of the League;
(c) The permanent International Court of Justice;
(d) The permanent Court of Arbitration;
(e) The Executive Committee of the League;
(f) The Board of Conciliation;
(g) The International Administration Offices.

The Congress of the League shall be the meeting of representatives of the states belonging to the League. Each state shall send three delegates, but shall have only one vote. The Congress shall meet at least three times a year at The Hague. The Congress shall be the supreme organ to carry out the purpose of the League of Nations. It shall elect a President when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it first meets, who shall conduct the business until another President is elected. The decisions of the Congress shall require a two-thirds majority.

The permanent Committee of the League shall be composed of representatives appointed by the states belonging to the League to act on that Committee. These representatives must reside permanently at The Hague. The states belonging to the League of Nations shall not have power to appoint their diplomatic representatives at The Hague members of the Committee. The permanent Committee shall receive its instructions from the Congress through the President, on the basis of the duties allotted to him in this agreement. The distribution of business, and particularly its conduct, shall be decided by a majority resolution.

The permanent International Court of Justice shall be formed on the lines of The Hague draft of an agreement respecting the institution of a Court of Arbitration (1907).

Articles 43 to 50 of the first Hague Convention of October 18, 1907, shall be authoritative for the permanent Court of Arbitration.

The Executive Committee shall consist of nine members, and shall be formed as follows:

Each party shall appoint two members, and nominate two neutral states, each of which shall appoint one member. Switzerland shall appoint the President. If there is delay in making the appointment or nomination, Switzerland shall request neutral states to nominate the members in place of the state which has delayed making the appointment. If Switzerland is an interested party to the dispute, or is nominated as a neutral state, another neutral state, to be nominated by the four neutral states already nominated, shall take her place.

The international Board of Conciliation shall be formed in the same way as the permanent Court of Arbitration (Article 43 ff. of the first Hague Convention of October 18, 1907) on the basis of a special list, from which the members of the permanent Court of Arbitration shall be excluded.

The International Administration Offices shall be the central offices of the International Unions. Their competence, their organization, and their procedure shall be decided by the individual Union treaties.

III

Security and Procedure in Cases of Dispute and Compulsion

Article 8

Disputes between states, which it has not been possible to adjust by diplomatic means, must be dealt with by law, or by arbitration, or brought before the International Board of Conciliation.

Article 9

The International Court of Justice shall be the regular organ for legal decision of legal disputes between states. Each member of the League of Nations shall have the right of taking action in this Court, and of compelling an answer to the accusation. The decrees shall be issued on behalf of the League of Nations.

Besides disputes between states, the International Court of Justice shall be admissible for:

1. Complaints brought by private persons against foreign states and heads of states, if their objection that the state courts of justice are incompetent is made good.

2. In cases of disputed interpretation of state treaties, particularly in the sphere of international private right, if the verdict of a state court of justice as to the disputed claims is contested by international appeal instead of appeal to the supreme court of the country.

Article 10

The permanent Court of Arbitration shall be competent on the basis of an arbitration agreement, or on the basis of a resolution passed by the international Court of Arbitration.

The assignment may be proposed to the international Court of Arbitration, on the ground that an arbitration agreement provides for the competence of a Court of Arbitration.

Cases may also be sent to the permanent Court of Arbitration on the ground that the question in dispute affects the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the state, or that it is not a legal question, but a political dispute or a mere conflict of interests.

Article 11

The international Board of Conciliation shall be competent to act if the matter is assigned to it by resolution of the international Court of Arbitration (Article 10), or the unanimous proposal of the states concerned. Its activity shall be directed to effecting an understanding and an adjustment.

The regular form in which it shall conclude its treatment of a case in dispute shall be a proposal based on a legal opinion.

The parties must state in writing, within a period to be fixed by the Board of Conciliation, whether they accept or reject the proposal.

Article 12

The Executive Committee shall be the organ of the protection which the League of Nations is bound to afford its rules against violation and menace, as well as for the execution of decisions. It shall act in the cases for which general provision is made (Articles 20, 41), as well as by order of the Permanent Committee, if a state belonging to the League proposes it, on the ground of a complaint made against another state belonging to the League.

Article 13

The Executive Committee shall pass judgment as to whether League of Nations obligations have been violated or menaced, and as to what measure of compulsion shall be applied.

Article 14

Compulsory measures of the League of Nations are in particular:

(a) The imposition of an indemnity.

(b) Breaking off diplomatic relations by the other states.

(c) Economic measures of compulsion, particularly vetoes on imports and exports, fiscal differentiation, restrictions on the trade or legal protection of subjects of the state violating its obligations in the other states belonging to the League, stoppage of passenger or goods traffic, or news.

(d) Confiscation of ships.

The costs of the compulsory measures shall be borne by the state against which they are directed.

Article 15

In the last resort, military measures of compulsion may be decided on. The injured state may be authorized to take these measures alone, or in conjunction with other states.

Article 16

The members of the Executive Committee shall give judgment in accordance with their independent judicial opinion, conformably with the principles of international law and the laws of humanity.

Article 17

The procedure shall follow the rules for the procedure of the permanent Court of Arbitration, with the proviso that it does not require an arbitration treaty. Either party may propose the abridged arbitration procedure.

Article 18

The Executive Committee shall supervise the carrying out of the compulsory measures. It shall be qualified to give supplementary judgments for the carrying out of the measures, inclusive of questions of costs.

Article 19

If a third state believes that it cannot be expected to carry out the compulsory measures (Article 15) with which it is charged, without imperilling substantial vital interests of its own, it is entitled to appeal to the Executive Committee.

Article 20

If a state is attacked by another state, or is directly threatened with an attack as a result of military measures, it is en-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

titled to defend itself in the name of the League of Nations. But it must immediately inform the permanent Committee of the League of Nations of the measures of protection it proposes to take, and this Committee shall cause the Executive Committee to be formed at once.

The Executive Committee shall decide, first of all, as to the justification for self-defence. If it finds no such justification it must forbid it at once, and award compensation to the state injured by the prohibited procedure. It must also take the necessary measures for the period before the pronouncement of judgment.

Article 21

If measures of violence between states belonging to the League of Nations give cause for intervention, the permanent Committee of the League must make a provisional order without delay, which shall remain in force until the Executive Committee shall give judgment. The Executive Committee shall be constituted at once.

IV

Limitation of Armaments

Article 22

Military and naval expenditure shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 25 per cent. of the military and naval expenditure in 1919. The Congress of the League of Nations shall determine and supervise the carrying out of this principle.

V

Freedom of Communications

Article 23

The seas, and the canals and straits connecting the seas, shall be open to ships of all the states belonging to the League of Nations equally.

No state belonging to the League of Nations shall be allowed to treat sea-going ships and cargoes belonging to other League of Nations states less favorably than its own.

To insure this principle, international shipping commissions shall be organized at great ports with a mixed population.

Article 24

Every subject of a League of Nations state shall be entitled to make use of the roads and railways of all League of Nations states for through traffic, with his own means of transport.

Article 25

The air shall be open to the aircraft of all League of Nations states equally.

Article 26

The subjects of League of Nations states must be put on an equality with the natives in every League of Nations state, as regards personal liberty and the right to a domicile, educational freedom, police and legal protection, acquisition of landed property, religious property, copyright and patent rights, and freedom to come and go.

The subjects of states belonging to the League of Nations must not be subject to higher taxes, fees, and other imposts than the native inhabitants in any League of Nations state.

Article 27

In every League of Nations state, the subjects of the other League of Nations states must be treated equally. This applies particularly to freedom to settle and carry on an industry in the country, taxation, fees and other imposts, permission to take advantage of educational establishments and other cultural institutions.

Article 28

The League of Nations states shall mutually guarantee one another economic equality of right, and shall bind themselves to friendly cultivation of their economic and commercial political relations.

Article 29

The League of Nations states shall mutually guarantee one another most-favored commercial and fiscal political treatment: this implies that every favor granted to another League of Nations state, or to a state which does not belong to the League, is granted unconditionally and unreservedly to all the other League of Nations states.

Article 30

Vetoes or restrictions on imports or on through transit shall be inadmissible. Vetoes on exports may be proclaimed only for food and fodder. If they are proclaimed in dominions, colonies, Crown colonies, or protectorates, they shall apply to the mother country also.

Article 31

The provisions of Articles 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30 do not exclude police precautionary measures in matters of public safety, health, and traffic in the individual League of Nations states.

VI

Colonial Matters

Article 32

The following principles apply to the colonies and Crown colonies, including the protectorates of the League of Nations states:

1. The administration of the colonies must be governed by the principle of justice. It must serve the just claims of the natives and of the colonizing people.

2. The colonizing states shall be bound to protect the natives and to raise their moral and economic position. In particular, the colonizing states must provide for complete abolition of the slave trade and of slavery; further, for health, education, welfare, security of land ownership, and protection of native labor. They must take measures against the abuse of alcohol and narcotics. Trade in arms and munitions shall be regulated.

3. The religious societies recognized in the League of Nations states shall be guaranteed the free exercise of their religion and mission. The sphere of activity of the individual missionary societies may be defined by the colonizing state. This shall require the approval of the League of Nations.

4. An armed power may exist in colonial territories only to the extent necessary for the maintenance of order. Colonial troops may be employed only for the protection of their own colonies.

5. The commerce of all peoples must enjoy complete freedom in colonies. All flags shall have free access to the coast, the lagoons, and the rivers flowing into them, together with the river beds, as well as to the inland rivers and lakes. All unequal treatment of ships and goods shall be prohibited, particularly in respect of all duties, and the procedure in levying them. Exceptions, particularly monopolies of all kinds, shall require the approval of the League of Nations.

6. No distinction may be made between a state's own subjects and foreigners with regard to the protection of their persons and property, the exercise of their profession and trade, the acquisition of personal or real property, and the bestowal of public appointments.

7. An International Administration Office (World Colonial Office) shall be instituted to supervise and carry out the above provisions.

8. In every colony, agents of the League of Nations (League of Nations Consuls) shall be bound to see to the observance of the above provisions. The colonizing state shall be bound to help them in every way in the exercise of their activities. In case of the provisions under this head being violated, the agents shall be entitled and bound to report to the World Colonial Office.

VII

Protection of National Minorities

Article 33

The League of Nations shall guarantee the following protection to the national minorities, *i. e.*, the groups of persons who are subjects of a state or reside permanently in the state territory in their national character, but not belonging to the people of the state:

(a) All states belonging to the League of Nations shall be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bound to give the national minorities in their territory just parliamentary representation in proportion to their numbers. Where the minority lives in small groups, mixed with the majority of the people, the system of national registration shall be applied.

(b) No one belonging to a national minority shall have his political rights disregarded, or be at a disadvantage as regards freedom, personal position, property, economic activity, or legal protection, on account of his belonging to this minority. It shall be open to communes in which the national minority is sufficiently represented to institute and hold school instruction, church service, and official work in the language of the minority.

VIII

PROTECTION OF WORKMEN

Article 34

The League of Nations states shall undertake to establish a minimum of institutions of equal value in their countries for the protection of the life and health, as well as the personal freedom and rights, of the workers. An International Administration Office (World Labor Bureau) shall be appointed to superintend and extend labor rights.

IX

SAFEGUARD AGAINST INCITEMENT OF PEOPLES AGAINST ONE ANOTHER

Article 35

The League of Nations states shall undertake to combat all incitement of peoples against one another by word of mouth, or in writing, or pictures, by their legislation and administration.

X

INTERNATIONAL UNIONS

Article 36

The League of Nations shall further all efforts to unite the common interests of the peoples, and aim at the development of existing and creation of new international institutions, particularly in the sphere of law and economics (for instance, world postal union, protection of copyright, weights and measures and coinage, world adjustment of payment). The existing unions shall be attached to the League of Nations as far as possible.

The Sankey Report

THE report of the British Coal Industry Commission, comprising in fact three separate reports signed by different groups within the Commission, was made public on March 20. The one of the three reports here printed, signed by Mr. Justice Sankey, Mr. Arthur Balfour, Sir Arthur Duckham, and Sir Thomas Royden, and commonly referred to as the "Sankey report," was accepted by the Government as its proposal for the settlement of the dispute.

THE RECOMMENDATIONS.

As to Hours and Wages.

1. We recommend that the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1908, commonly called the Eight Hours Act, be amended by the substitution, in the clauses limiting the hours of work underground, of the word "seven" for the word "eight" as and from July 16, 1919, and, subject to the economic position of the industry at the end of 1920, by the substitution of the word "six" for the word "eight" as and from July 13, 1921. Certain adjustments must be made in the hours of the classes of underground workers specifically mentioned in the Act.

2. We recommend that as from July 16, 1919, the hours of work of persons employed on the surface at or about collieries shall be forty-six and a half working hours per week, exclusive of meal-times, the details to be settled locally.

3. We recommend an increase of wages of two shillings per shift worked or per day worked in the case of classes of colliery workers, employed in coal mines or at the pit-heads of coal mines, whose wages have in the past been regulated by colliery sliding scales. In the case of workers under sixteen years of age, the advance is to be one shilling.

4. We recommend the continuation of the Coal Mines Control Agreement (Confirmation) Act, 1918, subject to certain suggestions indicated in our report.

5. The result of these recommendations will mean: (1) a shortening of the working day underground by one hour from July 16, 1919, and probably by a further hour from July 13, 1921; (2) a distribution of an additional sum of £30,000,000 per annum as wages among the colliery workers.

6. It is thought that these results may be obtained, as explained in our report, without raising the price of coal to the consumer.

As to Nationalization.

7. By Section 5 of the Coal Industry Commission Act, 1919, it is provided that the Commissioners shall as soon as practicable make an interim report on the questions of the wages and hours of work of colliery workers. By Section 1 (f) it is provided that the Commissioners shall inquire into any scheme that may be submitted to or formulated by them for the future organization of the coal industry, whether on the present basis or on the basis of joint control, nationalization, or any other basis.

8. The Prime Minister promised in the House of Commons on Tuesday, the 25th February, that a decision as to the two issues of wages and hours should be arrived at, if possible, by March 20 (see Hansard, Wednesday, 26th February, pages 1694, 1695, and 1698). The promise to furnish this Interim Report on wages and hours by March 20 has been redeemed.

9. Even upon the evidence already given the present system of ownership and working in the coal industry stands condemned, and some other system must be substituted for it, either nationalization or a method of unification by national purchase and, or, by joint control.

10. To some of our colleagues whose opinion we greatly value nationalization has been the study or ambition of a lifetime, and they are prepared at once to report in its favor.

11. We understand that to others, whose opinion we equally value, some scheme of joint control appears to be a solution of the problem.

12. No detailed scheme for nationalization has as yet been submitted to the Commissioners, nor has any scheme for joint control been placed before them.

13. No sufficient evidence has as yet been tendered, and no sufficient criticism has as yet been made, to show whether nationalization or a method of unification by national purchase and, or, by joint control is best in the interests of the country and its export trade, the workers, and the owners.

14. We are not prepared to report now one way or the other upon evidence which is at present insufficient and after a time which is wholly inadequate, nor are we prepared to give now a momentous decision upon a point which affects every citizen in this country; nor, as appears from the report in Hansard above referred to, did our chairman ever pledge himself to do so.

15. We are prepared, however, to report now that it is in the interests of the country that the colliery worker shall in the future have an effective voice in the direction of the mine. For a generation the colliery worker has been educated socially and technically. The result is a great national asset. Why not use it?

16. We are further prepared to report now that the economies which should be effected by improved methods would be in the interests of the country, and should result in the industry yielding even better terms for the colliery workers than those which we are at present able to recommend, and at the same time yielding a fair and just return to the capital employed.

17. We think that the result of the colliery workers having an effective voice in the direction of the mine, coupled with the better terms just referred to, will enable them to reach a higher

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standard of living to which, in our view, they are entitled, and which many of them do not now enjoy.

18. We think nothing but good can come from public discussion between workers and owners, and also from private deliberations between them. There has been too much secrecy in the past.

19. It must not, however, be forgotten that, after all, the question of nationalization or a method of unification by national purchase, and, or, by joint control, is ultimately one of policy to be determined by Parliament and not by this Commission, although this Commission will be able to consider and report upon the various schemes or suggestions which may be put forward as a final solution of the problem.

20. There is one further subject which, although it forms no part of the promised interim report, is of so urgent a character that we feel it our duty to draw public attention to it.

21. Evidence has been placed before the Commission as to the housing accommodation of the colliery workers in various districts. Although it is true that there is good housing accommodation in certain districts—and to some extent—there are houses in some districts which are a reproach to our civilization. No judicial language is sufficiently strong or sufficiently severe to apply to their condemnation.

22. It is a matter for careful consideration whether a 1d. per ton should not be at once collected on coal raised, and applied to improve the housing and amenities of each particular colliery district. A 1d. per ton on our present output means about £1,000,000 a year.

23. When this Commission meets again it ought, in our opinion, to continue to make interim reports with suggestions as to the different ways in which economies and improvements in the coal industry can be effected, and power should be given under which these reports could be immediately acted upon.

24. It would be impossible to present one final report for some months, and then a similar period would probably elapse before Parliament would be able to deal with it.

25. By a series of interim reports containing suggestions which could be immediately acted upon and tested, it would be possible to start at once a scheme for the reconstruction of the industry with a view to putting it eventually upon an efficient basis.

26. It is suggested that the best method of proceeding would be to make these reports as rapidly as possible, and at short intervals, so that at the end of a period, say, of six months, it would be seen, after due trial, whether these suggestions are worthy of being permanently adopted in the Act of Parliament which must eventually be sought to secure the reorganization of the industry.

THE REPORT.

1. The popular title—Eight Hours Act—of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1908, is to some extent misleading. The bill as it originally left the House of Commons provided, after the lapse of five years, for eight hours exclusive of one winding, but the Act as eventually passed provides for eight hours exclusive of both windings. In other words, the time both for lowering and for raising the workmen is outside the eight hours. In the result, many workmen are down the pit for a very much longer period than eight hours, the average for the whole country being eight hours and thirty-nine minutes.

2. The question of reducing the hours of colliery workers is a serious and difficult one; serious because it must admittedly reduce output, difficult because it is a matter almost of impossibility to estimate how much it would reduce output. It would be, in our view, too dangerous an experiment in these circumstances to recommend a two hours reduction at once, and we have had great difficulty in coming to the conclusion whether it is better to recommend at once a true Eight Hours Act as originally intended, or the substitution first of seven hours and later of six hours for eight in the present Act. We have come to the conclusion that the latter is the better course, because it will not tempt persons to put men down and bring them up too rapidly—a system which might lead to more accidents. The reason for recommending the further reduction in July, 1921, is that we think we are justified in assuming that in two years the output should have reached, by the united efforts of all concerned, the amount of coal raised in 1913, namely, 287,000,000 tons.

3. The seven hours Act will mean that the men are underground, taking the average, seven hours and thirty-nine minutes, and, relying upon the valuable and weighty advice of Sir Richard Redmayne, the Chief Inspector of Mines, the estimated decrease in output will be a little under 10 per cent. per annum.

4. We think that it is too dangerous to the consumer and to the country to recommend the full demand of 30 per cent., which would require £45,000,000, although it is a demand which, after a time, might, and probably could, be conceded.

5. We recommend an increase in wage to all colliery workers of 2s. and 1s. a day respectively for each day worked, and our reason for this and the result of the reduction of hours and the increase of wages will be found below. The reason 2s. and 1s. are recommended instead of a percentage is that it remunerates the lower-paid worker in a fairer degree; and, after all, the necessities of life are no cheaper to him than they are to his more highly paid comrade.

6. We do not think it is possible to recommend that the reductions in hours should come into immediate effect. It will be remembered that the Eight Hour Act did not come into force in Northumberland and Durham until after a year had elapsed, and elsewhere until after six months had elapsed. Consequently, we recommend the reduction in hours as above set out.

7. The estimated cost of this increase in wages and reduction in hours will be as follows for the remainder of this present year: wages increase, £30,000,000; decreased output at 10 per cent. over six months, making, say, 250,000,000 tons for the present year, £13,000,000.

8. It will therefore be seen that to meet the decreased hours and the increased wage a sum of £43,000,000 is required this year. To meet this it is proposed, through the machinery of the Coal Mines Control Agreement, as amended for the purpose, to allow the coal owners to retain 1s. 2d. per ton of coal raised.

9. The difference between 1s. 2d. per ton thus allowed to the owners (which equals, on an output of 250,000,000 tons, £15,000,000) and the profit that might have been earned on the present basis of wages and hours, or £54,000,000, is £39,000,000.

10. It is, however, certain that the present price of coal to neutrals cannot be maintained, but that it will fall to an amount which may represent for the remainder of the year on the neutral tonnage a loss of about £9,000,000 on present prices. The £39,000,000, less £9,000,000, leaves £30,000,000 toward the £43,000,000 necessary to be provided this year for the decrease in hours and the increase in wages; in other words, a deficit of £13,000,000. This deficit it is hoped to make up by various economies, *e. g.*:

(1) The miners' leaders have pledged themselves to do their best to prevent voluntary absenteeism at the mines, and we rely, and we think we are right in relying, upon the honor of the miners to do in peace what they have already done in war, that is to say, to flock to the assistance of the country.

(2) If the 10 per cent. estimated reduction of output can be decreased, and if the output of the first year of the war, namely 1914, 266,000,000 tons, can be maintained, the difficulty of finding the money will be greatly minimized.

11. Again, the coal owners in their turn should do everything in their power, by improved methods of coal getting and underground travelling, to save labor and lengthen the actual time spent at the face.

12. Again, economies (a) in production, (b) in transit, (c) in distribution, can undoubtedly be effected, although it is difficult to place any money value upon them at the present moment.

13. This Commission should not at its future meetings discuss questions at large, but should concentrate itself upon par-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticular economies and improvements, and make its report upon each, and have the suggestions carried into operation through the machinery of the Coal Control, so that they may be immediately tested. It will probably be found necessary to have a short Act of Parliament for this purpose, very much upon the lines of Section 3, sub-section (1), of the bill to establish a Ministry of Ways and Communications, which is now before the House of Commons.

14. One of the early problems to be taken in hand by the Commission should be the question of royalties and wayleaves.

15. Finally, it is strongly urged that these matters should be taken in hand at once by discussing and putting into operation units of economy and units of improvement, without waiting months and months for a full and complete scheme to be placed before and passed by Parliament. The following are indications of some of the units to be decided on immediately: (1) housing, (2) baths at the pit-head, (3) clearance, (4) continuity of transport from the colliery, (5) reduction of voluntary absenteeism; (6) use of machinery in mines, (a) coal cutting, (b) coal conveying, (c) underground transit; (7) pooling of wagons, (8) elimination of unnecessary distribution costs, (9) uniformity of accounting.

16. The recommendations and report do not refer to Ireland.

The Claims of Egypt

THE statement which follows forms the concluding and larger portion of a memorandum submitted by the Egyptian Association of Paris to the Peace Conference and to "the authorized representatives of democratic opinion throughout the world." The omitted portion of the memorandum is a sharp indictment of early British rule in Egypt.

On December 17, 1914, giving as an excuse the declaration of war against Turkey, Great Britain declared that the latter had forfeited its rights in Egypt, over which she immediately extended a protectorate. The Egyptian people showed their dissatisfaction, the Government also. England then declared that the protectorate would be only temporary and would cease with the war. Trusting in this promise the Egyptians, instead of pleading difficulties, came to her aid. Egypt became the base of military operations in the East. She supplied the expeditionary forces. More than £232,000, *i. e.*, more than 6,000,000 francs, was subscribed in aid of the British Red Cross, in addition to the war charities subscribed to the French Red Cross and in addition to the war charities subscribed by the Egyptian Red Cross. Further, the Egyptian army served at Sinai, in Arabia, at the Suez Canal, in the achievement of the independence of the Hejaz, and finally in the defeat of the Turkish armies in Syria and Mesopotamia. The danger of a general rising in the Sudan, at one moment very imminent, was dissipated by Egyptian troops, who acted as guards during the whole war. Thousands of Egyptians volunteered to work on the western front, numbers of our countrymen have died for the cause of right and liberty, and numbers have been decorated for bravery in the field.

The armistice was signed on November 11, 1918. The Egyptian Government requested England to keep its promise and to declare the protectorate at an end; but once again England failed to keep her word. Rushdi Pasha, the Prime Minister, asked to be allowed to leave for London. This request was refused. The people on their side delegated Said Zagloul Pasha, vice-president elect of the Chamber, ex-Minister, and rector of the National University, and several other elected members to present the situation of the country, first, directly to English public opinion, and, second, to the Peace Conference, and to demand in the name of the people independence under the direction of the League of Nations.

Although the delegation was composed of representatives of all classes, religions, and political parties, *i. e.*, it represented public opinion in its entirety, it preferred to appeal to the country. Voting papers circulated to this end were confiscated after having received more than 2,000,000 signatures, including those of elected members, members of Parliament, provincial councillors, municipal councillors, etc. The necessary passports for the delegation were refused. The population, wounded in its feelings and its aspirations, rebelled. In its name the delegation protested, first to Mr. Lloyd George, then to President Wilson and the Peace Conference, and finally to the accredited Ministers of the countries represented in Egypt and to all the foreigners residing there. The Rushdi Ministry resigned on December 4, 1918.

In reply to these protests the English authorities arrested and deported to Malta the president and the members of the delegation. On the day of their departure the nation wished to give evidence of its sympathy. Great manifestations took place in all the towns through which the train passed. These manifestations, although pacific, were dispersed by revolver shots and bayonets. Hundreds were killed and wounded and hundreds were imprisoned. The nation, disarmed—for from the beginning of the war England had taken away all arms—spontaneously called a strike. Members of Parliament left their seats, students their colleges, pupils their schools, magistrates their benches, lawyers their bar, and workmen their work. General Watson, commending the English troops, printed a manifesto stating that the country was still under martial law and threatening all manifestants with summary execution. Putting his threat into execution, he had several shot. This policy of provocation exasperated the crowds; uprisings took place throughout the country, and the insurrection became general.

Had the British Government, in order to restore order and thus avoid useless massacres, released the national delegation and allowed it to accomplish its purpose, that would have been sufficient. It would have shown itself in accord with the principles of humanity and liberty of which it calls itself the champion. But no. It has preferred to persevere with its policy of provocation, and has appointed General Allenby as High Commissioner, with discretionary powers "to restore order and to have the King's protectorate respected." Thus a nation of 16,000,000 souls is arbitrarily handed over for having proclaimed its right to dispose of itself.

We appeal to the Peace Conference, and beyond it to democratic opinion throughout the world, in order that this crime may not be accomplished. The Peace Conference, met to give the world peace and justice, cannot before history take the responsibility of delivering 16,000,000 souls, without defence, almost without arms, to the machine guns of General Allenby. The Peace Conference has accepted the mission of settling all questions capable of troubling the peace of the world, and cannot, therefore, leave the Egyptian question undecided.

The Egyptian people demands to be heard on the same footing as the Syrians, Lybians, Armenians, and the Hejaz, which, like it, formed part of the old Ottoman Empire. It has the more right because it has fulfilled all the conditions required at the Conference in order to be represented directly. It, in fact, broke with the Central Empires at the beginning of the war, in which war it has participated effectively, and to the extent stated above, on the Allied side.

The Conference requests England to release the national delegation. It demands that the delegation be heard. It will set forth the grievances of the Egyptian nation as the latter has freely expressed them. These grievances are dominated by the highly humanitarian principle, "free in our country, hospitable to all." We summarize the grievances from the memorandum which the delegation handed on January 20, 1919, to M. Georges Clemenceau, president of the Peace Conference, in order that he might submit them to the Conference.

Independence

We demand that independence be recognized,

(a) because of the natural and imprescriptible right of nations;

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(b) because England has never ceased to claim it, at the cost even of the blood of its children;

(c) because Egypt now considers itself freed from the last remnants of sovereignty which attached it to Turkey;

(d) because it holds that the moment has arrived to proclaim a sovereignty which its moral and material situation justifies.

Rights of Foreigners and the Public Debt

We place ourselves in the hands of the League of Nations to fix the guarantees which it may judge necessary to this effect. We take the liberty, however, of pointing out that the public debt constitutes only a very slight charge compared to our national fortune. We shall not fail to call upon the specialists of the whole world in the future as in the past for aid.

Internal Reform

The first reform will consist in the establishment of a democratic Constitution. Public instruction, fiscal reform, and customs must immediately be established on new bases. Finally, commerce, agriculture, hygiene, and social questions must be the subject of laws which will aid the general well-being.

Suez Canal

We are willing to accept any measures which the Peace Conference may judge necessary for safeguarding the neutrality of the canal.

Retrocession of the Sudan

We demand that the Sudan be restored to us. It is the soul of Egypt, seeing that the Nile rises there. On our side, the Convention of January 9, 1899, which England persuaded a weak Egyptian Minister to sign, has no legal value. It is null and void, since Egypt had no legal authority to sign.

Egypt and the League of Nations

Egypt will be honored in placing its independence under the guarantee of the League of Nations.

It is clear from the foregoing that our movement is neither Nationalist, nor Pan-Islamic, nor Pan-Arab, nor anti-foreign. It is not anti-English. It is Egyptian. We ask for nothing better than to live on good terms with the English as well as with all other nations. They will always be welcome in our country. But we wish, on the other hand, to be free in our country.

The Foreign Policy of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes

THE official Information Bureau of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes at Washington has made public the following address, delivered by Mr. Stoyan M. Protitch, Prime Minister and Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, before the National Assembly. Brief extracts from the address were published in American newspapers of April 13.

GENTLEMEN OF THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY:

At the moment of the opening of the debate on the address in response to the speech from the throne, you have the right to request the head of the Government to lay before you the international situation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, which represents the national and state union of our three-named people. I therefore take the liberty of replying to this legitimate request, though it has not been formulated in words, and in sketching, in its main lines, the international situation of our young kingdom.

As soon as our national unity was accomplished and proclaimed by the official state documents of which you have cognizance, the Royal Government notified all Allied and neutral Governments of the formation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, as well as of the formation of the first Cabinet of the new state. Up to the present time we have received the following replies to our notification: from the kingdom of Norway at the end of January, from the United States of America at the beginning of February, from the kingdom of Greece a few days later, and from the Swiss republic in the first days of March. These replies contain the recognition of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes as a new international entity, under reserve, of course, of the new frontiers. In addition, our kingdom was recognized by the two new Slav states, the Czecho-Slovak Republic and the Polish Republic.

Unfortunately, up to the present we have not been able to place on record any recognition of our state by our allies, France, Great Britain, and Italy, although it was natural that the first recognition should have come from them. This would certainly have been sent if the secret Treaty of London of April, 1915, had not existed. This secret treaty, by its very composition as well as by its formal clauses, denies our national and state unity to the profit of one of our allies. We are profoundly convinced that this is not only the principal but the only reason why France, Great Britain, and Italy have not, up to the present time, recognized our Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. For if it could be alleged as a reason for not recognizing the kingdom that the peace has not yet been signed and that the new territories of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes have not yet been delimited, the same reasons would be valid for the Czecho-Slovak and Polish Republics, the more so as their participation in the war cannot be compared to that of our people and the kingdom of Serbia, which at that moment represented our entire nation. For the same reasons the United States of America might have abstained from recognizing our kingdom.

It is also extremely probable that the attitude of the kingdom of Rumania, which has not yet replied to our notification, is explained by the fact that another secret treaty was concluded in the month of August, 1916, between Rumania and our Allies. By this treaty also a foothold was taken on our territory.

We must regret that there are thus two points of view for judging the same fact, especially when it is a question of an ally who has always been faithful and who, we can frankly declare, has merited well of its allies and has spared neither blood nor efforts to reach the common goal, the victory of our cause. Without counting those who have perished in prison camps, Serbia has sacrificed in killed, in dead from wounds and disease, more than 290,000 soldiers.

It is still more painful for us to note that the parts of our national territory which had the misfortune to belong to Austria-Hungary, and which today form an integral part of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, are today regarded as enemy territory.

With all the respect due to our friends and allies, we must now, in expressing our profound regret, protest against this in the name of all those Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes of the former Austro-Hungarian monarchy who fought on the fronts of Salonica and the Debrudja with so much heroism and abnegation; in the name of all those Jugoslav battalions which surrendered on the Italian front in order to aid the advance of the Allied armies, and which fought on it later; in the name of these Jugoslav prisoners who as volunteers aided the cause of the Allies by their devotion, by their knowledge of the movements of the enemy, of his force, and of his morale.

It must not be forgotten that it was only after the crushing blow delivered to the enemy on the Salonica front that the final advance on the Italian front began. It was after our offensive of September 15 of last year that the Anglo-Franco-Italo-American offensive began on the Piave, in the month of October. It should further not be forgotten that it was precisely at this moment that Zagreb (Agram), the capital of Croatia, broke the bonds which attached it to Hungary. Thus, by land and sea, we came to the aid of the Allies who were advancing from the west.

These few words will, I imagine, suffice to let you judge, gentlemen, in what a difficult and delicate situation our new kingdom finds itself at the Peace Conference. After our victory over the enemy we are obliged now to prove to our friends and allies the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justice of our demands, to make appeal to their solemnly-proclaimed principles and declarations, to ask their aid against the secret treaties concluded in the past at the expense of our national rights. The situation is, therefore, as delicate as it is difficult and confused. But nevertheless, gentlemen, we do not despair. Our demands are only too legitimate, and the principles on which they are based are most sacred and in accord with the most modern ideas. For these reasons we dare to hope for the complete victory of our national claims if, after this terrible war, the nations really intend to take as the basis of the new order of things in Europe and in the world the principles laid down and proclaimed by the honorable President Wilson, and if the solemn declarations of our allies on the equality of great and small peoples from the point of view of free determination of their destinies are still valid.

No people can found a durable existence, its national well-being, and its future on principles contrary to the fundamental ones which are a guarantee and a condition of its existence, the well-being of the international community and the existence and the happiness of humanity. A people could profit only for a certain time by applying such principles; it might for a decade or two, perhaps even for a century, raise itself above the others, but in the end nothing but loss could accrue to it, with incalculable consequences.

An unjust or a wrong policy by the great nations could, it is true, cause the small peoples to perish and disappear, but the people bearing the glorious names of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, who have succeeded in guarding their names and their virtues during centuries of struggle against two such terrible enemies as Austria and Turkey—a people with such vitality need not fear this fate, less now than ever.

It could, however, only profoundly regret being obliged to continue to expend its material and moral forces in a struggle which could be carried on at its expense and at the expense of those who do not wish to recognize its sacred national rights, and which would render unstable all hopes of peace and a better life in Europe and in the world.

People begin to reproach us [on the ground] that our national claims are exaggerated, that we are seeking to annex foreign elements. These reproaches, it is our conviction, are as unjustified as they are unjust, and we are ready to reply to them immediately. Foreign elements live on the periphery of our national territory as they do on the territorial peripheries of all other nations. This is perfectly natural. No one is ignorant of the fact, for example, that the periphery of the Italian territory which marches with the frontiers of our present state, that is to say, before the war, is inhabited by two to three score thousands of our compatriots. Also, in the frontier regions between Greece and Serbia there are Serbian elements beyond our frontiers and Greek elements within them. But there is one important and characteristic fact. This is that the foreign elements inhabiting the peripheries of our national territory in the north, northeast, and northwest on one side, and on the southeast on the other, did not come there by a process of natural expansion. On the contrary, it was the Turkish, Venetian, Austrian, and Bulgarian authorities which planted these foreign elements in these regions. Can anyone now have the right to reproach us if we claim those parts of our natural territory, giving the inhabitants full liberty either to withdraw if they do not desire to remain with us, or to express freely their option for Italy or Rumania? What could one do that would be more liberal or chivalrous? Could such a policy be characterized as imperialism?

At the same time that these unjust reproaches are addressed to us, the army of one of our allies, without calling forth any reprobation, penetrates more deeply into Albania, to our very frontier; and yet it was our battalions which arrived first at Mati and Scutari and drove out the enemy. At the same time another of our allies was allowed tranquilly to put forward its pretensions to certain parts of the western Banat, although this Banat never formed part of its national territory, which already counts among its present population a sufficient number of foreign elements.

According to our profound conviction, we had the right and the duty to lay before the tribunal of the future peace our entire national question. If we had not done so, we would have committed a crime against our people and against the future peace of the world. We have considered it our duty frankly to tell the whole truth and to expose to them the situation as it exists.

At the same time we are firmly resolved to defend our legitimate rights, persuaded that in so doing we are accomplishing a sacred duty toward us and toward our Allies; for none of our demands are based on the principles of the past or on principles which the enemies of human liberty and progress could one day use to their profit to accomplish their aims and plans.

I will not insist longer on the delicate and difficult relations existing between the Italian army of occupation and the population inhabiting the long and wide belt of our great kingdom which has the unhappy fate of lying within the zone of occupation. The situation, as strange as it is abnormal, is a very painful one, for it has put the patience of this part of our population to a severe trial. In this part of our kingdom all the population belongs to our purest race, and greatly desires to form an integral part of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, with the exception of certain insignificant and sporadic Italian enclaves. Yet the Italian army has been entrusted with making peace and order reign in the entire region.

As to the conduct of the Italian authorities of occupation, I will mention only certain notorious facts. After having prohibited our national flags as well as the standard of our new state, they have caused the Italian flag to be hoisted everywhere. They force the inhabitants to take the oath of allegiance. They exact from the new functionaries who desire to enter the administration [an assurance] that they make their demands in such a form as [will cause them to be] considered as Italian officials. They deport notable inhabitants. Misunderstandings, conflicts, even riots are the natural consequences of this abnormal state of things, and it is easy for you to imagine, gentlemen, what effect must be produced on this part of our population and on ourselves by the words of the honorable Premier of the Italian Government, that "Italy cannot remain deaf to that most Italian of cities, Fiume." You know as well as I do that the Croat Fiume not only calls us, but implores us, to receive her into our midst as soon as possible, as do Istria and all the region of Gorizia. The large number of Italians in Trieste and the town of Gorizia does not constitute a sufficient reason for their not being given to us, any more than the great number of Italians in New York could furnish a reason for refusing that city to the United States. This territory, all the region of Trieste and Gorizia, as well as that of Fiume, are ours, just as all the region of the Bachka and of the western Banat, to which naturally belong Temesvar, Vrshatz, and Bella-Tzerkva, in spite of the fact that the enemy intentionally and by abuse of its authority modified the proportions of the national elements in these three towns during the last two centuries.

May I be permitted to repeat at the end of this brief speech that we demand the application of the principles which our allies have put forward against the Germanic theories of violence. All our demands are based on the principle of the free self-determination of peoples and on the principle of nationalities, with an independent tribunal and the arbitrage of the United States. If these principles are valid for others, they ought also to be valid for us, the more so because we will never make appeal to them except [as we take] for our basis the above-mentioned principles.

A RECENT reprint of the reconstruction programme of the British Labor party, together with an introductory article by Mr. Arthur Henderson and some useful explanatory notes, has been published by W. R. Brown, 200 West Eighty-sixth street, New York, as No. 1 of a series of "Reconstruction Reprints."

LIBRARY
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Press

The Acquittal of Villain

THE recent acquittal at Paris of Villain, the murderer of Jean Jaurès, was the subject of the following editorial in the London *Nation* of April 5.

The world has long been engaged in accustoming itself to pessimism. It has tried to obey the precept of the sage and not be too surprised at anything. But though the exercise has been assiduous, it is still hard. Some sailor's instinct is always at work prompting us to stretch our sails to every breeze of hope. We say, for instance, to ourselves that the world is in a frenzy still; and, although the debauch of war is ended, the morning headache is a condition still far removed from sanity. But there are signs of its return, and upon these the optimist builds. He does it for the most part unconsciously, and only realizes his invincible desire to believe in and hope for the good when some incredible event descends like a lightning flash to illuminate for one lurid instant the intellectual chaos and moral degradation of the world.

Such an event is the acquittal of Villain, the murderer of Jean Jaurès, by a Paris jury. After all, says the cynic within us, when the flash is ended and the incalculable darkness descends again, why not? It is hard, indeed, to hold back the impulsive reply which would assume the validity of imperatives which we know are disregarded, or the existence of honesties which have long ago been scrapped as hindrances to getting on with the war. It is too hard. We confess that our pessimism was imperfect. We were not prepared for this, and we refuse to accept it. The verdict has been passed, and we know that it cannot be recalled. Accept it as a fact we must; but we may refuse to accept it as a characteristic fact. We choose rather to regard it as marking the nadir, the consequence of tendencies that have long been manifest. . . .

It has, we hope, some justification. A verdict such as that which the jury of bourgeois Frenchmen passed an Jaurès's murderer leaves precious little room for the humbug which has been so generally practiced, and with such success in all countries during the war. The pretence of European civilization is revealed by its light to have worn so thin that it can impose on no one. Villain was acquitted because he was a "patriot." The mockery of the whole affair was emphasized by the long procession of eminent witnesses, who deposed that Jaurès was also a patriot, inspired by the noblest motives. Minister after Minister, reactionary, bourgeois, and Socialist alike, swore—they could do no less—that Jaurès was inspired by the single thought of sparing his country and the world the horrors of a war the nature of which he clearly foresaw. There was no question of any attempt to *saboter* the mobilization of the French army. Jaurès had always condemned the scheme, which was the peculiar property of M. Hervé. It was established that Jaurès's idea was to save the situation at the last second by persuading his own Government to hold back the Russian generals, and his own Government, if he could, to appeal to President Wilson to arbitrate upon the dispute. . . .

Jaurès was, indeed, one of the very few men, perhaps the only man, who could have saved Europe. For that reason he was shot by Villain. We do not doubt that the reason was presented to him in other terms. He may, as his judges benevolently suggested, have been misled by anti-Socialist propaganda; he may even have convinced himself that Jaurès was the enemy of France. The fact remains that the precise reason why Jaurès was declared to be an enemy of France by the royalist and militarist reactionaries was that he wished, and made no concealment of his wish, to prevent a war. They, like their jingo counterparts in Germany and England, wanted war. They believed, rightly enough, that a war was the prelude to a monarchical restoration; they desired a France that could only be kept together by the constant display of military force. Let it be granted, however, that Villain was so simple as to know none of these things, and that he believed, on the word of Jaurès's political enemies, that the great Socialist, the leader of European socialism, was an enemy of France. Cottin, the boy who shot at M. Clemenceau, was also simple enough to believe, on the word of the French Premier's political enemies, that he was the enemy of France and humanity. M. Clemenceau was not killed; he was merely confined to his bed for a few days. Yet Cottin has been condemned to death; Villain has been acquitted. In the eyes of a Paris jury, Villain was a patriot and Cottin a murderer. We have, for ourselves, not the least desire to see Villain condemned to death, but that he should have been acquitted with honor within a month of the sentence on Cottin is a perversion of justice so monstrous that we can only regard it as the extremity of national aberration.

The French are commonly reputed to be more logical than we. Perhaps the verdict was due to an excess of logic, the absence of which would prevent an English jury from giving full rein to its own convictions. No English jury has had the opportunity, and we do not know how it would act in a similar case. Probably the demeanor of an English judge would be stern enough to prevent so gross a perversion of justice. But we do not doubt that the impulse which the French bourgeois indulged would be present in an English middle-class jury also. The most we can believe is that they would succeed in suppressing it. We have no mania for definition or deduction. The French have. The importance of their acquittal of Villain is that it affords a definition of patriotism as currently conceived in the year of our Lord 1919. A patriot is a man who kills Socialists. That is interesting enough, but there is a further point to be elucidated. It is not even yet as clear as it should be whether he is a patriot because he kills Socialists, or whether he kills Socialists because he is a patriot.

The difference is not unimportant. In the particular case we do not know whether Villain's patriotism was demonstrated to the panel of *hommes moyens sensuels* by the fact that he murdured Jaurès, or they knew (from evidence that was certainly not made public) that he was a patriot before the murder, who deliberately put his creed into practice when the occasion offered. On the whole, the published evidence tells in favor of the former thesis. Villain seems to be one of those men who reveal their innate but obscure nobility of soul by a supreme and unexpected action. So might a common criminal produce a Union Jack from his pocket on the scaffold and sing "God Save the King." He, too, would go down in history as a patriot. But if the rôles were uncomfortably reversed, and one of the Bolshevik desperadoes, of whom we have heard so much, had thought to have secured a niche in the new Russian pantheon by a well-aimed shot at Sir George Buchanan, his claim could not have been admitted. Sir George is, as far as we know, not a Socialist. Therefore, to kill him would remain murder, even in Russia. For a definition of this kind must be valid everywhere. Is it possible that patriotism should be killing Socialists in Entente countries, and killing Ambassadors in Russia?

No; it is impossible. The Entente is victorious, and it is the privilege of the victor to impose his morality upon the world. It is indeed a little unfortunate that Russia should not yet have been wholly subjugated, for there is a chance that another more curious and more inconvenient morality may sweep westward. A new patriotism may become contagious which will consist precisely in killing bourgeois. Whether the verdict of the Paris jury was really the best method of defence against its incursion we hesitate to say. That it is a logical defence we are assured. The logical defence against revolution is to cut Socialists' heads off. The real trouble is that they grow so fast. With the best will in the world one cannot prevent men from becoming revolutionaries in obscurity. When the head-chopping becomes fast and furious, the Socialist birth-rate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increases by thousands a day, until there is nothing for it but to employ one-half of a nation in playing policeman to the other half. That is the logical consequence of the Paris verdict. No one, not even the jurymen who gave it, believes that it has the remotest connection with justice. It is a measure of self-preservation, and it will not be long before its folly is apparent to all the world.

A Swedish Protest from Seattle

THE first of the following documents is a resolution adopted by Swedish residents of Seattle, Washington, at a mass meeting on February 23. Following the meeting a correspondence was entered into between a committee of the protestants and Mr. A. Caminetti, United States Commissioner of Immigration, Mr. Alvey A. Adee, Second Assistant Secretary of State, and Mr. Henry M. White, Commissioner of Immigration at Seattle. The letters received, particularly that of Mr. White, were the subject of discussion at a further meeting on March 23, at which time an elaborate report on the correspondence and the situation in general was adopted. The committee was also instructed at that meeting to submit to the Department of Labor the questions which form the second document printed below. The documents are reprinted from the Seattle *Union Record* of March 29, which also printed the correspondence and the report of the meeting of March 23.

I.

During the time that has elapsed since the conclusion of the war there has been carried on a marked propaganda in the local and State press in order to create an unfriendly sentiment toward all foreign labor in this city and State.

Motions have been placed before the State Legislature at Olympia providing for the exclusion of all foreign labor on public works, etc. Even if those motions should not pass, a feeling is already created against us foreigners which makes it extremely difficult for us to obtain employment.

Furthermore, through the very complicated machinery by which permission to leave this country can be obtained, and by denying us passports to Canada, and in many instances also to our mother country, we are compelled to stay in the United States and endure the present conditions.

The cost of transportation to Sweden is at the present time next to prohibitive for a workingman. Add to this six weeks or two months during which we have to await the necessary passport, which time, owing to the above-mentioned causes, must be spent in idleness, and it is easy to understand our present hardships.

We claim that the daily press, with very few exceptions, is mainly responsible for this hostile attitude toward us. According to the press, we and other foreigners are solely responsible for the present unrest in the industrial field. In many instances Swedish citizens have been arrested without warrant or other legal document, held in jail many months before [being] given a hearing, and oftentimes finally liberated without a hearing or any legal proceedings whatever. A considerable number of our countrymen are today only allowed their liberty on bail ranging from one to five thousand dollars, and have been so held for nearly a year and in some cases longer, with a possible sentence of deportation held over them as a threat. Some of these men have applied in vain for permission to leave for their native country. It must easily be understood that a bail of five thousand dollars is a very heavy burden for a workingman to carry, and that no good can be obtained by prolonging this process any further. In particular, we feel that those cases where men have been held in prison for five or six months, and then released without learning even the cause of their arrest, are matters of the most flagrant injustice.

Now we frankly admit that, together with our American fellow-workingmen, we have tried to obtain higher wages and better working conditions. But we also claim that, during the past strenuous war-time, we gave freely every bit of our strength and ability in the American industries side by side with our American brothers, in order to preserve democracy for the world and for generations to come.

If the present agitation of hatred against us foreigners is not curbed it will be absolutely necessary for us to leave this country, because the result of that agitation will be our total exclusion from the labor market, in which alone we can gain a living. In such case it will also be necessary that provision be made for us to leave immediately, before our funds are entirely gone and we have become a burden to society.

In case our presence in this country is not desired, we wish a clear statement to that effect from the United States Government, because in such case we will do all in our power to assist the Government in the matter of our deportation. We will, in such case, leave this country with nothing but the best wishes for its many millions of splendid men and women whom we have learned to love and admire during our stay here.

In the light of what has here been set forth, be it therefore resolved:

1. That we Swedish working men and women, in mass meeting assembled, to the number of one thousand, at Seattle, Washington, this 23d day of February, 1919, do request the Government of the United States to make an immediate investigation of the origin and purpose of the above-mentioned propaganda against us in the daily press.

2. That a clear statement be asked from the Government of the United States setting forth in unmistakable terms whether or not our presence in this country is desirable, and also what constitutes sufficient cause for deportation.

3. That in case the Government of the United States deems it advisable for us to leave this country, such arrangements be made and means provided by which we can immediately proceed with our departure.

4. That the Swedish Government be requested to provide us with necessary means for our transportation to Sweden in case our presence here is not desirable to the Government of the United States.

5. And be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be given to the press for publication, and that a similar resolution in the Swedish language be forwarded to the Swedish Government at Stockholm, Sweden, and to the Swedish Embassy at Washington, D. C., and also be published in the Swedish press of this country.

II.

1. Can a Swede who desires to return to his native land secure a passport allowing him to depart at once?

2. Can a Swede secure a passport allowing him to enter Canada to escape the blacklist used in this part of the country?

3. Can immediate trial be given to those who are being held by the immigration authorities or who are out on bail?

4. Can your Department assure us that those who are ordered deported will not be held indefinitely in the jails and detention stations of this country?

5. Is membership in the Industrial Workers of the World a crime at this time?

6. Does belief in and advocacy of the principles of the Industrial Workers of the World and solicitation for members constitute a crime, where it is not shown that an accused party believes in and advocates the destruction of property and the overthrow of the government by force?

7. Is it the attitude of your Department that we must force Swedish workers to leave the Industrial Workers of the World and to adhere to the American Federation of Labor, as per Commissioner Henry M. White's suggestion?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

IN a special Washington dispatch, dated April 25, the *New York Times*, in its issue of the following day, published the text of an official résumé of Italian claims "in the form in which they were presented to the Paris Conference by the Italian peace delegates." The dispatch states that "this résumé was prepared by the diplomatic representatives of an Entente Power, cabled to Washington through non-Italian channels, and procured from a non-Italian source today. It is a summary of a memoradum which was read to the Peace Conference by Signor Barzilai, which contained considerably more than 5,000 words." The résumé in question is identical, save for an omitted passage, with a résumé of the memorandum as published in the *Allied Press Supplement* to the *Review of the Foreign Press* of March 26, issued by the British War Office, the complete text of which, with the exception of a portion of the final paragraph which was condensed because of limitation of space, was published in the International Relations Section of the *Nation* on April 19.

THE Danish *Folketing* has at present under consideration several important measures looking toward fundamental changes in land distribution and ownership. Each party has presented a programme, the most thoroughgoing being that of the Socialists. The Government has presented three measures which will probably form the basis of an acceptable compromise. One of these measures provides for the conversion of entailed estates, and estates held in fief or trust, into free property, the owner of the estate paying to the state a certain percentage of the entire value of the property and turning over to the state a part of the property for conversion into small farms. According to a statement in *Tidens Tegn* for February 17, if all owners of entailed estates make use of this opportunity the Government will acquire not less than 40,000 *tönder* of land (one *tönde* = one and two-sevenths acres), while the money payments will aggregate 90,000,000 kroner. The second Government measure is for the conversion of parsonage land, yielding in all some 45,000 *tönder*, into small tenant farms. The new farmers would receive from the state loans amounting to seven-eighths of the cost of erecting necessary houses and other buildings. The third measure would give the state the right to expropriate a certain proportion of the land included in large estates, particularly land improperly utilized; while cities would be permitted to expropriate private land for building purposes where no publicly-owned land was available. The Socialist programme of land reform, upon which the Government measures appear to have been based, demands the immediate distribution for farming purposes of all suitable church and state property; state ownership and immediate distribution of all entailed estates and estates held in fief; and the parcelling out of a certain percentage of the land included in large private estates—expropriation, if necessary, taking place on the basis of existing land prices. The programme also provides for state assistance to land workers and a tax on land values.

THE present Governor of Yucatan, Carlos Castra Morales, is a railway worker who was elected to the Congress of Yucatan on the Socialist ticket by 52,000 votes as against 800 cast by all the other parties. In February of the present year he submitted to the Yucatan Congress, which consists of sixteen deputies, all Socialists, a plan for the formation of a coöperative company under Government regulation. He stated that earlier coöperative attempts, undertaken by General Salvador Alvarado, had failed because of defective organization and management. Later ventures along the same line, under the auspices of the Defence Leagues of the Socialist party, had proved to be so successful that the Government believed that the time had come for it to take part in directing and extending the movement. The plan proposed by the Governor provided for the formation of a society which should operate under the management of a competent board of directors, headed by an executive director who in turn should be subject to Government supervision. The society was to be capitalized at $500,000, of which amount the Government, the Defence Leagues, and the Development Company of Sureste were each to subscribe $100,000, while the remainder was to be raised by private subscription. In appealing to the Congress of Yucatan for an appropriation to cover the Government's share in the undertaking, the Governor declared that the movement was being inaugurated, not to check the development of commerce, but to put commerce upon a just and rational basis; and that in his opinion the only way to accomplish this without the use of force was by the application of the principles of coöperation. The plan is now in operation, the organization being known as the Compania Coöperativista Peninsular.

OWING to conditions incident to the Revolution and to the Allied embargo against the Soviet Government, the total trade between the United States and Russia was reduced from $438,000,000 in 1917 to $28,000,000 in 1918. Imports from European Russia in 1918, amounting to $7,000,000, were a little over one-half the value of the imports—$12,000,000—in 1917; while imports from Asiatic Russia showed an increase from $2,200,000 to $4,000,000, owing to the importation of $2,000,000 worth of platinum in 1918. The great decrease in the total volume of trade was due principally to the decline in the export trade, the volume of which amounted to only $9,000,000 for European Russia and $8,500,000 for Asiatic Russia, a decrease of 97 per cent. and 93 per cent., respectively.

THE rights of Algerian natives have been considerably extended by a new French law, promulgated in the *Journal Officiel* of February 6. The law confers full French citizenship upon natives who fulfil certain conditions, and throws open public employment—with certain exceptions to be announced in a future decree—to non-citizens on the same terms as to citizens. Natives whose names are included in the electoral lists are to be subject to the same conditions as citizens in regard to crimes and misdemeanors, except for certain regulations pertaining to forest conservation. The chief opposition to the law was directed against the clause which permits native municipal councillors to take part in mayorality elections.

The
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Section

of the *Nation*, containing articles on international questions, English texts of important documents, selected editorials and other matter from the foreign press, and news notes of events throughout the world, is issued fortnightly with the coöperation of the following

Advisory Council

André-Louis Chevrillon, Paris.
Winston Churchill, Windsor, Vermont.
Stephen P. Duggan, College of the City of New York.
The Rt. Hon. Sir George Foster, Ottawa, Canada.
John A. Hobson, London.
Henry Goddard Leach, American-Scandivanian Foundation.
John Bassett Moore, Columbia University.
Gilbert Murray, Oxford.
Rómulo S. Naón, Washington.
Joseph Reinach, Paris.
James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University.
Jacob H. Schiff, New York.
Oscar S. Straus, New York.
Frank A. Vanderlip, New York.

The International Relations Section is sold only in connection with the *Nation*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED